DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 986	FL 010 840
TITLE	International Linkages in Higher Education Feasibility Study. Supplemental Report.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Universities, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.: Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.: Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 79
GRANT	G007701115
NOTE	92p.: For related document, see ED 181 717.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Developing Nations: Higher Education: *Interinstitutional Cooperation: *International Educational Exchange: *International Programs: International Studies: *Postsecondary Education: *Universities

ABSTRACT

Supplementary information is provided for the final report of a feasibility study on establishing working relationships between American and foreign institutions of higher education. A brief overview of the development of campus international education is presented, and selected examples of institutional programs are discussed. An analysis of this material is made that suggests that an institutional focus for international education activities maximizes resources and has the broadest and most extended impact. A brief review of the foreign academic perspective is offered. An increased interest in academic cooperation with the United States is reported, along with a decline in interaction, both in the developed and developing world. The need for increased contact is viewed as most acute for the developing countries. Past exchange experience is assessed in order to develop approaches preferred by foreign educators and government officials. Finally, the linkage mode of mutually beneficial academic partnership is explored in some detail, and several elements of international activity are considered in relation to the linkages model for American international academic cooperation. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TITLE VI, NDEA , SEC. 602
G00-77-01115

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED182986

International Linkages in
Higher Education Feasibility Study

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Flora McKenzie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Supplemental Report

FL010840

submitted to the
Foreign Language and Area Studies
Research Program
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Grant # 600-77-01115

June 30, 1979

Final Report

Office of Education No. 600-77-01115

Period (as extended) from July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1979

Project: International Linkages in Higher Education
Feasibility Study

Administered by: National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges

date: July 1, 1979

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. International Education on Campus 7

III. International Education on Campus: Selected Examples 13

IV. Foreign Academic Perspective on U.S. Cooperation 51

V. Conclusion 68
International Linkages: An Additional Means of Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education

I. Introduction

The International Linkages in Higher Education Feasibility Study which began in early 1976 comes to an end with the submission of this final supplementary report to the Office of Education. Initially sponsored by the seven associations of higher education (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, with the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges as administrative agent), it was supported by grants from U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Ford Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation. The Study's principal focus was on the internationalizing of U.S. higher education--its teaching and research; the role of language and area studies; faculty and student exchange; and participation in technical assistance to the developing world. The Study's purpose was to see if the time were right for major new initiatives and, if so, what those initiatives should be.

In July 1977 the Linkages Study submitted a Preliminary Report to government sponsors. The final Report was submitted in February 1978 to the Office of Education and other sponsors. This Report's two principal recommendations were:

1. The creation of a Council for International Cooperation in Higher Education within the structure of the higher education associations, to work with colleges and universities in the United States and abroad, and with government and private agencies to promote international understanding, improve cultural relations, and to take a new initiative in American international academic cooperation for development.
2. That the Council administer a grants program to support international institutional cooperation through mutually beneficial linkages as the best available means of maximizing private sector and overseas contributions to academic institutional collaboration.

Both of these recommendations have failed to mobilize support.

Prior to submission of the final Report the sponsoring educational associations agreed to form the CICHE. But despite intensive discussion, since that time they have failed to agree on the nature and scope of its functions, and on its organizational structure. Because of this absence of consensus it must be reluctantly concluded that there is no realistic expectation of creating a council as proposed by the Study for the present or forseeable future. Because of this impasse no funding proposals are pending for the Council or its program, the Linkages Study office has closed, and the Study task force disbanded. The NASULGC as administrative agent for the Linkages Study is submitting this supplementary Report to Office of Education in fulfillment of the amended terms of Grant # 600-77-01115. Its content reflects the views of Study staff and no further revisions of the final Report will be made since they could serve no useful purpose.

Dissemination of Results: A summary of the Study's report is being circulated to more than 800 foreign individuals and institutions. A summary of this supplemental report is being circulated to associations, institutions, government sponsors and additional agencies concerned with international education.

It may be useful to review here the origin and development of the Linkages Study.

Background: The International Linkages in Higher Education Feasibility Study had its origins in 1972 discussions between AID and the academic community. Both recognized the need for continuing relations between American higher education and higher education in LDCs to help upgrade the colleges and universities in the LDCs. As these institutions improved there was need for a relationship based on collaboration rather than tutelage, and American colleges and universities, having discovered the importance of linkages with LDC higher education, felt the need for extended overseas networks for teaching, research and service.

In 1973, the higher education community proposed the creation of the Association for International Cooperation in Higher Education and Research (AICHER) to move immediately to provide needed liaison between U.S. and LDC higher education to advance LDC institutional capacity for applied research, teaching, and extension in the service of development. Instead, AID made a grant (AID/ta-G-3120) to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in June 30, 1975, to study the feasibility of establishing such an entity. The study got under way in June 1976 when Fred Harvey Harrington, past president of the University of Wisconsin and advisor to the Ford Foundation, was named Director.

A higher education task force was formed for study design and execution consisting of representatives from the sponsoring associations. An AID task force was also constituted with representatives from regional and functional bureaus.

An important emphasis of the Study was on the interests and needs of foreign governments and higher education communities. Accordingly, a first step was to convene in November 1976 a panel of distinguished LDC educators to review with them Study purposes, soliciting their expert advice and continuing collaboration. Subsequently, field visits overseas by task force and selected university academic representatives were conducted in 39 countries, involving more than 150 institutions and organizations and 400 individuals. An additional 50 were interviewed in the U.S. from 30 other nations.

There were also meetings with American representatives overseas including ambassadors, AID mission personnel, cultural and information officers, and foundation representatives. Leading European agencies in technical assistance and educational linkages have been consulted as well as international agencies such as the World Bank, FAO, ILO, and UNESCO. In the United States there were consultations with federal agencies, Congress, and private international education organizations; also with members of the U.S. academic community and with more than 30 organizations and public and private agencies active in international education, and visits by staff to more than 35 campuses.

A search of selected literature on higher education and development and on general themes of international education was undertaken as well as a review of current reports, periodicals, and the policy statements of more than 300 organizations.

From the outset, it was felt that to represent adequately the geographic and functional range of American academic interest in international activities it would be necessary to have the financial support and involvement of several government agencies active in international education. With AID's encouragement, grants were obtained from the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) in September 1976 and the U.S. Office of Education's Division of International Studies (OE) in July 1977.

The CU grant permitted coverage of the full range of our educational relations in LDCs, particularly in those middle tier countries where as U.S. assistance to higher education has been diminished or withdrawn, CU is pressed to fill the gap with no compensatory increase in budget or alterations in policy and program focus. The CU grant also extended Study coverage to a general review of our academic relations with the developed world. It should be noted that senior CU officials expressed impatience at being asked to support a study rather than proceeding immediately to organize a liaison office. This reflects CU's growing concern about the lack of coordination of current U.S. higher education activities overseas, which in some lamentable instances threaten to discredit the reputation of U.S. higher education as a whole, with clear implications for the conduct of American foreign policy.

The OE grant to our study, effective July 1, 1977, was to support a review of the current state of international and foreign language studies and to assess current and future needs. In its review the Study paid particular attention to such new factors as the emergence of community colleges, the withdrawal of private foundations from support for international education and advanced foreign area research, and the changing overseas climate for field research. The OE grant was extended twice , now terminating June 30, 1979. Because of the various new initiatives within OE and the creation of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and Area Studies, much of the proposed original focus of work under this grant was rendered irrelevant. In September 1978, it was therefore amended to focus more specifically on the role of "linkages"--programs of planned, mutually beneficial partnership relations between U.S. and foreign institutions--as a possible additional mode of international education activity.

At the outset, the timing seemed auspicious for the Study's task, and its broad-based support, both in sponsorship and funding, indicated wide concern in academia and government about international education issues. In hindsight, the Study's timing could hardly have been worse. The change of political administration brought new leadership to all of the sponsoring government agencies, two of which underwent, indeed continue to undergo, reorganization. (For AID, reorganization is becoming a perpetual state.) During this period, too, four of the sponsoring associations experienced changes in leadership.

That the concern about international education issues was widespread is clear, since during the Study period several additional initiatives were undertaken, including the naming of the President's Commission and Commissioner Boyer's Task Force on Global Education, a Brookings Commission Study of technical assistance which led to planning for the Institute of International Technical Cooperation, for which legislation is now pending in Congress. There have been Congressional hearings, studies, research, innumerable conferences and more publications related to one or another aspect of international education. It sometimes seems that this is a field dedicated to perpetual motion but little forward movement. Certainly, it is one where only the long-view can be optimistic--for the realities of the modern world scene must inevitably lead to true internationalizing of our educational system. Meantime, much progress is made on our campuses, whatever the vicissitudes of national policy and conflict and competition within the multitudinous constituency for international education.

Organization of Supplemental Report

Section II presents a brief overview of the development of campus international education. Looking more closely at international education on American campuses, selected examples of institutional programs are presented. An analysis of this material is made which suggests that an institutional focus for international education activities maximizes resources and has the broadest and most extended impact. Section III then turns to a brief review of the foreign academic perspective, which formed a large part of the Study's earlier work. An increased interest in academic cooperation with the U.S. is reported, along with decline of interaction, both in the developed and developing world. The need for increased contact is most acute for the Third World, and past exchange experience is assessed in order to develop approaches preferred by foreign educators and government officials. Finally, the linkage mode of mutually beneficial academic partnership is explored in some detail, and several elements of international activity are considered in relation to the "linkages model" for American international academic cooperation.

II. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ON CAMPUS

A. Review of the Past

When Americans were concentrating on the domestic development of the United States, the colleges and universities of this country became heavily involved in the task of advancing that development. As the Republic has increased its international commitment, higher education has again played a critical role. This has been evidenced in every aspect of postsecondary education--teaching, research, and public service.

Even before the World Wars, there was interest in international education (campus teaching about the world), in faculty and student exchange, and in the participation of American faculty members in developmental programs overseas. Except for religious studies, campus teaching focused mainly on Europe during the nineteenth century, as did scholarly exchange, e.g., Americans going to Europe to study for advanced degrees. By 1900, however, we were paying more attention to the non-European world, and American universities were beginning to train a few experts in Asian, African, and Latin American studies. The same years brought the beginning, a trickle really, of students from those countries to the United States. And the earliest technical missions abroad, forerunners of AID operations, did feature what is now called the developing world.[1]

The great upsurge came after World War II. Much more than World War I, this conflict was a global war, and it was followed by the breakup of colonial empires, the emergence of newly independent, developing nations, and an expanded role for the United States. By then it was painfully obvious that there were too few American experts on many overseas regions; there was too little understanding on the part of government officials and the general public about foreign countries and their problems; and there was insufficient interchange of people and ideas.

Improvement was required in the national interest. Inevitably, much of the job was assigned to higher education. Colleges and universities stepped up their international offerings and training programs, absorbed an increased number of foreign students, especially from the developing nations, and became associated with improvement programs in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

---

[1] For this little-known story, see Merle Curti and Kendall Birr, Prelude to Point Four: American Technical Missions Overseas, 1838-1938 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954). Note that (1) many, though by no means all, of these missions were headed by American university professors; and (2) that financing came, as it does today, from American voluntary agencies, including foundations and the foreign governments of the United States and the developing nations.

A major part of funding for the increase in international education came from the regular budgets of the postsecondary institutions, from state legislative appropriations, private giving, and student fees. This was possible because this was a period of rapid growth and rising income for American colleges and universities. Supplementing this basic finance was heavy support from national foundations, in particular Ford, Rockefeller, Kellogg and Carnegie. As an example: The Ford Foundation spent more than $306 million on international education programs from 1951-73.

Still more important were federal government contributions at all levels. These meant support for area studies on campus through the National Defense Education Act (NDEA); funds for faculty and student exchange, notably under the Fulbright program; and the involvement of American institutions of higher education due to assistance in building developing country universities capable of turning out manpower and supplying the advice necessary for national development. Central to the latter effort were the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) and its successors, the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) and the Agency for International Development (AID). In the early 1960's there were 300 contracts with American universities in such fields as agriculture, engineering, and public administration.

At that time, a high-level committee, representing government, industry, the foundations, and higher education, reviewed the situation. Its widely circulated report, The University and World Affairs,[2] noted with satisfaction the campus boom in international matters. It saw the trend as in the national interest, indeed, essential in light of the global responsibility of the Republic. It therefore recommended that colleges and universities consider international teaching, research, and outreach as an important part of their basic mission. These activities should be expanded, the committee concluded, with support from state and federal government and from foundations and other private donors. Recognizing the need for liaison and leadership, the report also said that there should be a "new organization" to help higher education relate more effectively to national needs on the international front.

---

[2] Committee on the University and World Affairs, The University and World Affairs (New York: Ford Foundation, 1960).

Reversals: Optimism reigned when the Morrill Report was issued, and the 1960s did see further growth. But disappointments were ahead late in that decade and in the early 1970s. Education and World Affairs, the "new organization" proposed in the University and World Affairs document, proved less successful than had been anticipated and lasted only a few years. The Overseas Educational Service (OES), an associated enterprise created to recruit Americans for academic jobs in developing countries, had an even shorter life. In planning for the future we can learn a great deal from the history of these agencies, but their collapse did spell discouragement to internationally minded academics and officials.

Meantime, international education on campus faced trouble on the financial front. After helping at the start, the foundations gradually reduced their support of foreign area training and study centers in the major universities. The thought was that the federal government would provide support for international education on campus, through the International Education Act passed in 1966 and still on the statute books. Unfortunately, the IEA was not funded because of administrative preoccupation with the Vietnam War and lack of sufficient congressional enthusiasm. NDEA support for international education continued, but, though significant, it has never reached a fifth of the funding level authorized (though not appropriated) for IEA. In consequence, the number of foreign area centers has declined, and those remaining are starved for money in the 1970s.

Many institutions have drawn on regular budget funds to keep their foreign area centers going. This, however, has not been easy in the 1970s, a decade of tight budgets in both publicly and privately controlled colleges and universities. The squeeze was caused by rising costs, the leveling off-- even decline-- of enrollments, and the temporary lowering of public confidence in higher education after the student disturbances of the late 1960s. In addition, any reversals overseas appear to have reduced the enthusiasm of some citizens for international activity.

When the crisis came, some postsecondary institutions still considered international education an "extra", rather than essential to their basic missions. This inclination has been exacerbated by the tendency of exchange and research programs to focus support on individual faculty rather than on institutions. Thus, when economizing, too often universities have given disproportionate cuts to departments with international emphasis. Latecomers to international education--liberal arts colleges, the smaller universities, state and community colleges--have found it difficult to build new programs in the absence of outside funding. Moreover, difficulties have been increased by sharp declines in secondary school and college enrollments in the foreign language courses that have traditionally been recruiting grounds for international education.

There was bad news on the scholarly exchange front as well. The highly successful Fulbright program, which has made possible two-way movement of scholars, teachers, and students, was cut back in the 1960s. Dollar restorations since then have not kept up with inflationary increases in costs so, despite contributions from abroad (heavy in some cases, as in Germany) the program now operates at half its 1967 level. Higher education has continued to provide technical assistance to developing countries, yet there too the early 1970s brought reductions. Some of these were associated with foreign aid funding levels, some with AID unhappiness with the overseas performance of certain universities or with the dissatisfaction of educators with their relationships with American or foreign government agencies.

B. The Present Situation

Those interested in international education can find ample reason for discouragement in the declining public and private support for all elements of international education. However, we have become aware of a rapidly changing situation, one that offers many opportunities for colleges and universities to make significant contributions on and off campus. Four positive points struck us with great force:

1) There is emerging general agreement among American citizens that the U.S. is and will remain a world power and that the future of the Republic depends on international as well as domestic development. This consensus is clearer now than ever before and there is a growing tendency to think about developing as well as developed countries in considering the years ahead. Since learning looms large in the American scale of values, nearly everyone

now assumes that elementary and advanced schooling, including the education of adults, must not omit the international dimension--must also take on global perspectives. Unfortunately, this consensus has not been matched by agreement as to means of achieving the goal.

2. Reinforcing the tendency, "new actors" are constantly appearing on the scene. No longer are courses about the developing world concentrated in a few prestigious colleges and universities. In our visits we have found international education everywhere: in community and junior colleges, in the vocational as well as the academic sequences; in the smallest liberal arts colleges; in 75% of the state colleges and universities that train most of the nation's teachers; in institutions serving specialized groups, such as the predominantly black colleges and universities, technology and fine arts institutes, and continuing education agencies.

Nor is international education limited to a few courses in these and the rest of the three thousand postsecondary institutions in the United States. Our study group was impressed by the increasing quantity of global material in offerings that previously were limited largely to American and European content. This is true not only of traditional social science and humanities disciplines--economic and comparative literature are examples--but it is also the case in the natural sciences and in such professional fields as medicine, education, engineering, journalism, business administration, music, and agriculture. That there is a lag was suggested by the findings of the American Council on Education which estimates that still only five percent of all undergraduate students are enrolled in courses that deal with international affairs or cultures and most often these focus on the developed world. Nor do the specialized disciplines adequately reflect comparative perspectives despite the fact that, as Eleanor Sheldon, president of the Social Science Research Council, recently pointed out, they have:

> . . . important consequences for the development of both theory and method in the social sciences. New areas have been opened up for investigation and new phenomena pointed out that challenge the validity of many empirical generalizations--including widely-accepted notions about the variability of human behavior. New findings are causing scholars to reexamine some of the questions, concepts, methods, and units of analysis that have guided their research in the past.[3]

---

[3] Social Science Research Council, Annual Report 1976-77 (New York: SSRC, 1977), p. xiv.

3. The "new actors" and the old manage to move ahead, often by combining forces in consortia and by informal cooperation with each other, and with institutions and governments abroad.

4. There are hopeful signs that the higher education community is accepting a new level of responsibility at the national level for international education. For example:

> The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business have recently introduced requirements for international intercultural education for accreditation.
>
> AACTE, which has the largest international education operation, has this year added programs in Jamaica, Australia, and Afghanistan.
>
> The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) have appointed full-time professional directors for international programs.
>
> The American Council on Education (ACE) under its new president, Jack Peltason, has recently formed a Commission on International Education.
>
> Five associations have formed the Global Education Group to provide information and referral services to foreign educators and their institutions and will also undertake cooperative projects and programs.

As can be seen in the following review of selected programs, the success of campuses in developing international education rests primarily on their own investment and extraordinary ingenuity in exploiting a bewildering array of funding sources. But even with the most enterprising campuses, many opportunities on the international front are lost for lack of small amounts of funding.

III: International Education on Campus: Selected Examples

The range of activities which constitute international education on campus cut both wide and deep. The interrelationships among them--the multiplier effects of programs and activities on one another--is obvious but at the same time not easy to grasp. There is as great variation in approach to international education development as there are colleges, universities and community colleges. Each draws on its history, place, academic strengths, and perhaps most of all, on serendipity.

To provide a basis for later discussion, some examples of campus international activity are presented here. Each is unique but later analysis will suggest that there are certain elements central to success and that the movement is towards planned institutionalization of international education programs.

The first example is that of the University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus, one of the major state universities which is also a land-grant institution.

The Madison Campus of the University of Wisconsin

In the years since World War II, the University of Wisconsin-Madison has greatly increased its activities on the international front. Growth has been particularly striking since 1961, when the Board of Regents, on recommendation of the faculty and administration, formally declared the University's "obligation" to expand its international programs.

Today the budget commitment to international activities exceeds $30,000,000 annually. Two-thirds of this is drawn from "inside" sources, legislative appropriations and student fees; but over $10,000,000 comes from "outside" sources, the United States and foreign governments, international organizations, foundations and private giving. In the launching years, the 1960's, there was heavy dependence on funding from the major national foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation. But the University took care to carry its faculty largely on regular budget; hence there was no need to cut back operations when the foundations reduced their support of international activities on campus. There is some dependence on a continuing flow of funds from the federal government, as in the case of area studies programs. And there is a serious shortage of money for student support, and for faculty and student exchange.

Certain trends are worth highlighting. A decade ago support came almost exclusively from American sources. Now there is a significant flow of funds from international agencies and foreign governments. In a typical year recently, over half a million dollars for the Wisconsin programs came from the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the FAO and the UNDP. At the same time, more than a million dollars in grants and contracts came from foreign governments, including Indonesia, Brazil and Arab nations. Actually, the figure could be doubled if one counted support provided by foreign governments for students and faculty members sent to Madison.

This trend underscores an important point: The University is moving towards true international cooperation in our educational activities. This can also be seen in the University's linkages to specific foreign institutions. One of the University's best agricultural links has been with the University of Ife in Nigeria. Initially, under AID arrangements, Wisconsin supplied American experts to develop research, teaching and extension programs at Ife; and students from that institution came to Madison for advanced degrees, preparing to return to teach in Nigeria. More recently, Ife has been able to send a visiting professor to teach in Wisconsin; and cooperative research is now planned, not, however, yet properly implemented. In the future Nigeria, with its oil revenues, is expected to pick up some of the costs; and Indonesia already does this, in economic ties with Gadjah Mada University in Jakarta, originally supported by the Ford Foundation; and agricultural links with agricultural universities (AID-financed). A cooperative research-and-training project in archaeology is now being developed with India; this will depend more on Indian academic input than on Wisconsin's, and joint Wisconsin-American appointments are contemplated, both on a visiting and permanent basis. The two-way street can also be seen in cooperative projects in legal education in Peru, disease control in the West Indies and nuclear physics in Brazil. Also in the University's training program for developing-country administrators through the Center for Development, which ties in with previous Wisconsin programs and current research and exchange in east Africa, the Philippines and central America.

There has been real mutual advantage in the undergraduate exchange program for engineers involving the University of Wisconsin and the Instituto Tecnologico in Monterrey, Mexico; and it is anticipated that both sides will benefit from science-research exchanges now being worked out with China.

Successful though these efforts have been, they have fallen far short of potential linkage. In many cases excellent programs have not been followed up, for lack of financing. Thus a good start was made with Wisconsin-Roorkee (India) engineering ties; another with the University of Porto Alegre in Brazil in agriculture; a third with the University of East Africa and successor institutions in education, extension and technology, etc. In each case a continuing relationship would have yielded further dividends, especially as the developing-country institutions moved to more advanced programs; but continuing financing was not available. Efforts are being made to reestablish ties, through alumni relations, informal exchange of students and staff, and joint investigations. But this goes slowly and there are many missed opportunities. One that strikes home now is the early work done by Wisconsin chemists, engineers and anthropologists in cooperation with Mexican, Colombian and Asian investigators in solar energy--dropped for lack of funds.

In the last two decades, there has been a strong trend towards cooperation among American institutions interested in international matters. In Wisconsin's case, key progress has been made by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and Chicago. Now headed by Fred Jackson (who, when at Carnegie helped launch our Mexico-engineering exchange), CIC has helped these eleven Midwestern universities share strength in area studies, with faculty and student exchanges, combined summer language programs, library cooperation, etc. (The Midwest Interlibrary Center at Chicago, now a national resource, has also helped on the research-materials side). Meantime, some of the same institutions have set up the Midwest University Consortium for International Activities, which uses the resources of several campuses to mount effective overseas programs. MUCIA is now headed up in Madison; and more than two-thirds of the $3,500,000 Wisconsin obtains from AID flows through MUCIA. CIC and MUCIA were launched with foundation funds (Carnegie, Ford) but are now financed with University, federal government and foreign and international support.

While working with other major graduate centers, the

University of Wisconsin-Madison now cooperates closely with other types of institutions. Many of these are in the University of Wisconsin system, which has a large urban campus (UW-Milwaukee), nine former teacher-training colleges, two-year centers and an elaborate extension structure. There is also cooperation with private colleges in and near Wisconsin; and with schools and volunteer bodies. Examples: with foundation support, the University developed teacher-training programs in northern Nigeria, using teachers from Wisconsin's teachers colleges and private institutions, and master-teachers from the schools (ties here having developed with HEW programs). More recently, the South Asia center, with federal support, has concentrated on forging ties with all campuses in the state, and many beyond, and with the schools. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, located in the state's metropolis, has a strong public program, with a Latin American emphasis, and with help from the Johnson Foundation at Wingspread, has worked on business relations with Latin America, the school programs on the international front.

Here again, progress made underscores the great opportunities ahead. Future plans give heavy emphasis to this dimension of the international scene.

Originally, UW-Madison international activities were handled mainly by the deans. Engineering and medicine did well at first; other colleges lagged. From the late 1950's on, interest broadened. The Social Science division led the way in 1956, in insisting on overall attention to international education. By the late 1960's the central administration had begun to provide leadership. This was the turning point; it was through the central administration that the University obtained its first major international-support grant, from the Ford Foundation. This led to the establishment of a Dean of International Studies and Programs. Through this office, with presidential and chancellor support, further grants were obtained, from the foundations and the federal government. Thereafter, administrative appointments included international interests as selection criteria, which helped lead to excellent programs developed in Business Administration, Education and other colleges. Foreign area centers (originally there was only one, in Latin America) developed for Africa, South Asia, East Asia, and the Middle East, as well as Russia. Though given impetus by University technical assistance supported linkages, these centers were lodged in Letters and Science, as were most of the Junior Year Abroad programs (France, Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, India, and all these built in cooperation with other universities).

The College of Agriculture, which had pioneered with a World Land Tenure conference as far back as 1951, organized a Land Tenure Center for the University. This has worked well with the foreign area centers, notably South Asia and Ibero-American. With the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. and the federal government, the University created an International Cooperative Center, for a time very successful (Madison is something of a national cooperative center, so this fits naturally). And University Extension for a time had an international center for training of administrators. Meantime, other colleges have developed international programs, in cooperation with various parts of the University--Law, for example, has ties in Latin America, Africa and South Asia.

The total is impressive--over 200 faculty in the foreign area programs, with 8,000 student registrations. Over 1,500 foreign students, the majority of them graduate students. Improving relations with advanced nations, e.g., a faculty exchange program with Finland; cooperation on world climate control with European and Japanese scholars; visiting professors from abroad, in the Humanities Institute and in regular departments; international cooperation in such University specialties as cancer research (the largest grant for international activities in a recent year was $3,700,000 from the National Cancer Institute); adult education focus on international topics, tied to many study tours overseas arranged through University Extension; work with the state government on international economic development; hosting tours of foreign experts, notably in agriculture, and handling dozens of conferences annually that relate to international matters. And the university works actively with the higher education associations in Washington in international matters, particularly with NASULGC, AASCU, and AACJC. (Various parts of the University system have membership in all these associations, as well as in AAU, AAC and ACE.)

Currently, despite frustration on various fronts--the employment situation for recent graduates interested in international careers; the declining interest of national foundations in campus support in this field; the federal government uncertainties on international education; the lack of complete cooperation even on campus (an ad hoc committee has just recommended creation of a vice-chancellor position for the Madison campus). But with 100-150 Madison faculty members overseas on assignments each year; with enrollments holding up in international subjects; with entering students more interested than before in world affairs, the institutionalization of international education is well advanced and reasonably secure.

The programs of Virginia State University and North Carolina A & T State University dramatically demonstrate the impact of technical assistance activities on the development of campus international education. These have used the foreign experience for staff and curriculum development and community outreach. They were selected for analysis by the Study in part because of the success of their work overseas which was cited for excellence during the Study's overseas interviews.

Virginia State University

An 1890 Land Grant University, VSU draws most of its student body from the rural, south central region of Virginia. In 1969 the Bureau for Economic Research and Development was established to analyze and assist in solving the problems of low-income farm and rural business units. Recognizing the vital importance of this approach in developing countries, AID support was provided to strengthen competencies in Agricultural Economics and Economics. Subsequently, VSU has developed an impressive record of achievement in technical assistance programs, particularly in a long term linkage with Ghana.

Ghana Linkage: In 1975 an agreement was signed with the University of Science and Technology, Ghana, which is the basis for a highly successful linkage. The relationship with UST provides for the exchange of faculty, for both teaching and research, and for the exchange of students. Joint research projects are also undertaken and two international conferences on rural development have been held, one on each campus.

The relationship has been extremely beneficial for both institutions, with the impact on UST notable for the creation of its own "BIRD", the Bureau for Integrated Rural Development modelled on VSU's "BERD". With assistance from resident VSU faculty, BIRD fosters and formalizes a multi-disciplinary approach to rural development, and is the first of its kind in Ghana.

Success of the Ghana program laid the groundwork for other cooperative relationships. VSU and Mississippi State University have now signed an agreement with Kenya, and a program with the

University of Nigeria, Nsukka, and with Liberia are in the planning stages. In pursuing these new programs, VSU is committed to the principle of equal partnership and mutual benefit.

The Ghanaian link provides for faculty strengthening through research and teaching overseas. To date, six VSU faculty have visited UST for research, teaching, consultation and program development. This includes one faculty member who spent a year in Ghana teaching and participating in joint research projects, and another who spent an eight-month period doing research on his Ph.D. thesis. Four other faculty have been actively involved and twelve others have participated part-time.

AID strengthening funds have been used to develop the graduate program in development economics with one of the areas of concentration being economic development, including agricultural and rural development. Undergraduate courses in economics have been increased to reflect the emphasis on development. Other departments, such as sociology, history, education and business administration have used material gathered by BERD in their classes.

Impact of International Education: The international activities of BERD have had a strong impact on other departments, with members of the sociology, economics, agriculture, business administration and education departments involved. Beyond its own campus, VSU has become a prototype for other 1890 institutions who are interested in becoming active overseas, and BERD staff have served as consultants in this regard.

VSU gives graduate students the opportunity to do research overseas--to date two VSU graduate students have conducted their research projects in Ghana.

With the leadership of President Low, VSU is now developing a campus international studies program, and the presence of an active technical assistance program is having a noticeable impact (e.g. Ghanaian faculty on campus have given seminars for students and faculty on such topics as rural development problems in Africa and African history, culture and contemporary problems). There have been two international conferences (one in Kumasi and one at VSU) which have had a strong impact and were attended by delegates from Ghana and the U.S. and other African countries. French language training has been improved and geared to the needs of faculty and students who may work in French Africa. A series of three seminars were held for the college community to emphasize the importance of LDCs to the U.S. and to discuss the major problems confronting them.

With recently approved BIFAD support, Virginia State College plans to strengthen its international capability in the following areas: (a) small farm management, (b) marketing and transportation of food and (c) human nutrition. This university is especially interested in Ghana but will also direct some attention to Liberia and Kenya. Strengthening activities are grouped under research, consultation/advisory activities, linkages and networks, information dissemination and education and training.

The importance of BIFAD to VSU's international activity was described by BIRD Director Huey Battle as follows:

> The 1890 Land-Grant Universities and Colleges are facing a challenge that they are witnessing for the first time. It is one that is most welcome for it provides an opportunity for them to exemplify their ability to participate in a meaningful way in rural development on the international scene. Title XII, Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger, provides opportunities for 1890s to add a dimension to their land-grant activities by participating internationally with countries on problems not far removed from those formerly faced by the community they serve domestically. These problems traverse the whole spectrum of rural development.
>
> The extent to which 1890 institutions are prepared to transfer their land-grant skills depends, in part, on the level at which they have been fulfilling land-grant functions on the domestic scene... The challenge occurs, not so much in the preparation of a proposal but in re-directing the resources at the institution to respond to the extension of its land-grant activities abroad.

North Carolina A & T State University

Established in 1891 under the provisions of the 1890

Morrill Act, NCA&TSU in 1972 became one of the 16 constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina, and defines its central mission broadly: to develop manpower resources; to discover and disseminate knowledge; to provide a community service by extending knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of the campus. As part of the UNC it shares in the commitment to international education made by the member campuses. NCA&T has an enrollment of 5,300+, twenty percent of whom are studying to be teachers, and has 310 faculty, of which 25 now have worked overseas. There are 526 foreign students from 33 different countries.

NCA&T provides an important example of a small, predominantly black (15% white) training institution which is rapidly developing its capability to work with developing countries, but which, at the same time, is aggressively pursuing the goal to make all its students and faculty more knowledgeable about the world around them. Critics of A&T's international activity suggest that needs of the immediate community should be attended to before it becomes active overseas; the university administration is determined to show the benefits to students, faculty and community of overseas linkages. Leadership of President Dowdy has been a crucial ingredient of the University's success.

Overseas: The University has been involved in international service for some 30 years, providing short- and long-term training for foreign students, and providing release time for its faculty to assist in programs in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In addition, faculty members have worked in Indonesia, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Nigeria, Niger, Upper Volta, Sudan, and other developing countries.

Projects overseas funded by AID include: 1) providing assistance to Makerere University, Uganda, to establish a postgraduate degree in agriculture. This program was ended with the Ugandan upheaval in 1972 and the program was transferred to the University of Nairobi. This project is in consortium with Ohio State University and the University of West Virginia, with efforts underway to expand the program to include a wider linkage; 2) an agricultural manpower development and farmer training contract with AID in Tanzanian agricultural training institutions where four A&T staff members are currently working along with faculty from West Virginia State. 3) with support from the AID grant, a linkage is being established with St. Lucia in the Caribbean. Research studies have been undertaken, with the support of the Caribbean Development Bank, on the St. Lucia marketing system, and exchange of personnel is in the planning stage.

On Campus: In 1977 NCA&TSU received a five year 211-D grant from AID to strengthen existing capabilities in the area of small farmer technology and marketing analysis for rural development, in order to participate in international assistance programs. As a result, the University has, for the past two years, actively been seeking greater involvement in international activities and establishing linkages with educational institutions overseas, international organizations, and U.S. academic consortia involved in assistance programs. 211-D funds have been used to establish a masters degree in agricultural economics and to provide fellowships for 18 months to 15 students to study international rural development. Funds are also provided for faculty development. Ten faculty members will be directly affected by the program, and some have already been given overseas research experience (St. Lucia program). Internships for students are being sought, with three students currently working with SECID staff in Chapel Hill, N.C. Resource materials are being gathered, with the library now containing 8,000 relevant documents.

The 211-D activity is having a marked effect on departments. Faculty are encouraged to become involved and those showing interest will be included in the faculty development programs and research opportunities. In addition, appropriate curriculum is being revised to include international topics (e.g., the courses on Rural Sociology and International Economics).

A NCA&TSU proposal for funding under Title XII of the Famine Prevention Act, has just been approved. It will focus on the problems of accelerating the adoption of improved agricultural technology in selected African and Caribbean countries. Strengthening activities will be directed towards: (a) expanding the faculty's awareness and knowledge of Title XII, (b) faculty development, (c) improving language capability, (d) expanding library holdings and(e) improving the administrative structure to facilitate more involvement in international activities.

Although the 211-D grant is only two years old, programs to maximize the effect are already underway.

1) An international Education Minor Program is planned, which would consist of 18 credits in international topics. Training in French languages emphasizing the use of the

language in technical assistance will be offered. 2) An effort to internationalize the curriculum is underway with preliminary groundwork underway in all departments. 3) A Director of International Programs has been appointed. His office provides administrative support and general coordination of international activities of the University. The Director serves as chairperson of the Faculty Committee on International Programs, which is made up of representatives of all the schools of the university. The purpose of the committee is to strengthen the international content of the research, teaching and service programs of the University. The University has a stated policy that equal treatment in promotion will be provided to all faculty, whether involved in overseas activities or in residence.

Foreign students are used as a resource. Many special events have been produced to maximize their presence on campus. Plans are being made to start an International House which would be both an Intercultural Center and Residence. The increasing motivation of students to study other cultures is directly attributed to the presence of foreign students and A&T's involvement in international activities. Greensboro is now in a sister-city relationship with Benin, Nigeria, and there are plans to expand this relationship, which includes the University.

Brevard Community College

Brevard Community College, with strong leadership from its president, has provided national leadership to the movement to internationalize community colleges. Its own programs of staff and curriculum development, international linkages, student exchange, technical assistance and community service demonstrate that community colleges can participate fully and effectively in the full range of international education activity. Indeed, they have as much to offer in international exchange. Federal and donor support is vital for this segment of the education community which enrolls more than half of all undergraduates.

Founded in 1960, BCC has an enrollment of 30,000, 9,200 full time; three campuses; 250 full time faculty, 400 part time; and offers studies in 73 specialized fields. In a policy statement, BCC has identified a number of factors which dominate its interest in international education. These include providing: 1) quality opportunities for staff development, 2) for the internationalization of its curriculum, 3) members of the community with the opportunity to experience and develop an appreciation for diverse cultures, and 4) contributing to the strengthening and expansion of world relations. During the past three years, the college has become a leader among community colleges in international activity, having established linkages abroad and increased opportunity at home. It is a member of three international education consortia, of which its president, Maxwell King, is chairman of two and on the board of the third.

Overseas Linkages: In 1977-78, BCC and Malaspina College, British Columbia agreed to an exchange of faculty, staff and students. Eight students, three faculty and one support staff member participated from each institution. Costs are kept to a minimum by exchanging residences and faculty are expected to teach. Meetings held in Taiwan between cooperative members and Taiwan's junior colleges and technical institutions in 1978 initiated plans for an exchange of faculty and students. The agreement provides for 18 students to study in cultural courses in Taiwan with the Taiwanese students coming to the U.S. for study in technical subjects.

Faculty Development: Faculty at BCC are offered several opportunities to study overseas. These have included the following:

BCC faculty, through a community college consortium, participated in 1973 and 1974 in a federally supported summer study program at Jagellonian University in Krakow, Poland.

In 1978, BCC co-sponsored with the Consortium for International Education, Santa Ana, California, the European Studies Program for Professional Educators. 102 faculty, of which eleven were from BCC, traveled to seven countries for four weeks of intensive training in such areas as humanities, automotive research and repair, world literature, and allied health and nursing. Plans to repeat this program in 1979 with groups also going to the Middle East and Australia, New Zealand and Tahiti have been postponed for lack of funding.

One faculty member spent eight weeks in India for cross-cultural study on a Fulbright grant.

Students are encouraged to go overseas during the summer for which they can receive up to six hours of credit. In 1979, 203 students will go overseas, many with financial aid and loans negotiated through student lending institutions.

Technical Assistance

The increasing interest of educators in developed and developing countries in the American community college led BCC to assume a leadership role in forming the Community College Cooperative for International Development in October 1976. The intent of the Cooperative is to provide mid-level manpower training and technical assistance in occupational, vocational and technical education, while at the same time creating opportunity for faculty development, increased international content in campus curriculum and intercultural awareness for all students.

To this end, BCC and the Cooperative are successfully exploring linkage arrangements with seven countries. For example, with Taiwan, BCC through the Community College Cooperative for International Education, has also agreed to provide long-term technical assistance in vocational and technical education to Junior Colleges and other institutions. The agreement also includes short-cycle training programs in the U.S. for groups of Taiwanese faculty. Kenya: Plans to establish a linkage relationship with the Rift Valley Technical Institute in Kenya are in the final stages, an agreement initiated by BCC President King when he was sent by the CC to provide consulting services to that institution. In Latin America, negotiations are underway for technical assistance agreements between BCC and several Latin American countries, and an agreement with South Korea has brought forty-eight teachers to spend six weeks at BCC for in-service education programs.

International Activities on Campus: "It is a distinct possibility that within three to five years, all courses taught at the college will be offered within an international framework." BCC's emphasis on including international material in many courses is closely related to its overseas activities. Each student is currently required to take six credit hours of coursework with international/intercultural content.

Faculty who participate in Study and Travel Abroad programs are required to develop course material based on their foreign experience. The presence of a curriculum consultant from Guatemala under the OE Foreign Curriculum Consultant program and the possibility of a second program from Brazil has assisted the work already underway.

An OE grant to internationalize the curriculum is planned to complement ongoing ad hoc efforts. This will be done in two major steps: 1) introduction of an A.A. degree in international/intercultural studies, and 2) incorporation of international/intercultural concepts into selected occupational and technical programs. The A.A. degree, while global in nature, will focus on Latin American and African studies. Ten existing, required courses will be revised and three new courses will be introduced.

The second part of the curriculum revision will develop modules for instruction in such courses as automotive mechanics, electrical engineering, technology, hotel management, nursing and others.

Twenty-five faculty and 480 students will be directly involved in the program.

Foreign Languages: BCC is one of the few educational institutions where enrollments in foreign languages has increased steadily, with more than 800 students enrolling annually in French, German, and Spanish. An agreement has been signed with the Munich Language School for BCC students to study German, Italian and Russian intensively, in Germany.

Foreign Students are encouraged to come to BCC and are seen as valuable resources on their own cultures and will be asked to advise on curriculum changes. There are 300 students from 35 countries at BCC.

International Conferences: During the last several years, BCC has hosted and/or co-sponsored several meetings with international impact. (a) BCC plays a leadership role annually in sponsoring an annual conference in Florida for community college presidents on international education. (b) With the aid of grants totalling $25,000 from the OAS and the Tinker Foundation, BCC will host and play a major role in conducting a five-day meeting of representatives from the ministries of education of 24 member countries. The conference is on "Mid-level Manpower Training in Postsecondary Education" and will use BCC faculty as resource personnel.

Community: As a Community College, BCC's programs have an immediate impact and the college is aware of the opportunity it has to make the residents of Brevard County more knowledgeable of world issues. Local employers with international interests include NASA, Pan Am, the Harris Corp. and Disneyworld. Tourism is a major industry and proximity to the Caribbean and South and Central America emphasize local needs to be internationally competent.

As a result, local business is becoming increasingly supportive, with several companies providing assistance to college activities, such as sponsoring receptions and dinners for the forthcoming OAS conference. BCC has been able to assist companies such as the Harris Corp. with orientation programs for employees going abroad.

Structure for international education until recently has been centered on the President and his Special Assistant Robert Breuder. A Director of International Programs has now been appointed.

Lock Haven State College

The international program of Lock Haven State College is an example of how, with strong commitment and long term planning an extensive program of undergraduate exchange can be developed with relatively little outside funding. The program aims at the integration of international programs assuring the mutual reinforcement of exchange, curriculum development, practice teaching, foreign students, and community service.

Lock Haven State College is a small liberal arts college located in the mountains of north central Pennsylvania. Most of its students are local residents and are the first generation to attend college. Under the direction of President F.N. Hamblin (since 1970) a very successful international program has been established, one which has gradually come to effect the majority of students and faculty.

The Board of State College and University Directors identified "International & Cultural Education" as LHSC's special mission, and the college has adopted as a major goal of its academic program "To impart knowledge and understanding of its own and other cultures". LHSC is seeking to provide its students with the opportunity to participate in significant world cultures for overseas experience in the major geographic areas. So far this has been accomplished for Western Europe, Eastern Europe, South America, Asia with a link in Africa being explored.

Off-Campus: 1) A faculty and student exchange with Trent Polytechnic in Nottingham, U.K., begun in 1971, has to date resulted in the exchange of 117 American students and 10 faculty with 85 British students and eight faculty. The program is operated on a bed-for-bed exchange under which students pay the same costs as if they were at their home institutions, with additional cost only for transportation and personal expenses.

2) An exchange with Marie Curie Skodowska University was conceived in 1972 and began operation in 1976. The program provides for the exchange of ten students and two senior faculty from both institutions to study and teach for four months. The LHSC students are required to take formal courses in Polish language, history and culture and undertake an independent project on some aspect of Polish culture. They may also take two electives in their major field. The Polish professors at Lock Haven teach Polish, and the students who are actually junior faculty do research and participate in teaching. Again, the only cost to participants is transportation. The program also includes an exchange of published materials. This is one of the few American student exchanges with a Socialist country at the undergraduate level, and is the largest with Poland. To date 24 American students and seven professors have participated, and 25 Polish junior faculty and five professors.

3) LHSC is the lead institution for an AASCU-administered program with the government of the state of Buenos Aires in Argentina. While the agreement provides opportunities for American educators to go to Argentina, few have in fact been able to take advantage of the agreement, due to lack of funding support.

4) Overseas Student Teaching began in 1971 with the Nottingham program and was expanded to include American schools in Europe and South America in 1976. At the present time a student may request that half his student teaching experience take place overseas. To date, students have taught in American schools in Vienna, Berlin, Frankfurt, London, Antwerp, and Turin in Europe, and in Quito, Ecuador. Ten percent (48) of student teachers in the School of Education have taught overseas since 1976, as well as several from the School of Health and Physical Education. Students going

to Quito, and some in Germany, live with local host families free of charge in exchange for small amounts of English tutoring. In Quito, six former LHSC students have accepted full time positions. In addition, the director of the American school in Quito has signed an agreement with LHSC and the University of Alabama to provide a faculty member to teach an in-service course in Quito for both undergraduate and graduate credit. Tuition for the course is used to provide transportation and other costs so that the cost to LHSC is minimal. One LHSC professor was sent for 1978-79. The arrangement will continue next year.

5) The LHSC international program has extended into the sports arena with an agreement signed between the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation and Kyongi University of South Korea and Fu-Jen University in Taiwan for mutual development of faculty and students, exchange of professorial materials, teams, etc. In 1978 ten Korean educators visited LHSC and a seminar was presented by the director of Physical Education & Sports for the Minister of Education of Taiwan. The agreement provides for an exchange of martial arts and American sport and Physical Education philosophy and origin. LHSC soccer and field hockey teams have played in England and Ireland, and British and Danish sports teams have visited LHSC.

6) Student Internships: An internship program has been developed with the OAS in Washington. The college sends two students every summer to study and work there. The students receive credit and have the opportunity to participate in the work of an international organization. OAS pays each student a per diem amounting to $600 monthly. The LHSC program has stimulated legislation to assist other programs of this nature.

On-Campus International Activity: The academic program both reflects and supports LHSC's overseas programs.

1) Foreign Students and Faculty: In contrast to many American campuses, foreign students and faculty on the LHSC campus are considered a major component of the international education program. Their number has grown rapidly--in 1975 there were 30 applicants compared with 600 in 1978. In 1975 there were only three foreign students studying for only a year; today there are 35 full time degree candidates from 17 different countries, and altogether 62 foreign students and faculty on campus. These students and faculty present programs, lectures, exhibits and serve as resources for the college and community. They provide

an international dimension in the many courses in which they participate, give presentations to public schools, service clubs, churches and other organizations. For instance, the Polish participants provide public lectures on aspects of the Communist political system and the Socialist economy and give lectures at other universities, high schools and public organizations. The Board has approved tuition waivers for foreign students up to 1% of the student body.

2) Internationalizing Curriculum: Proficiency in a foreign language is required for all B.A. students and some B.S. students. As a result of the Polish exchange, courses in Polish history, culture, economics and government are now offered, and elements have been incorporated in existing courses. With a grant from the Toyota Corporation to the Pennsylvania Consortium of International Education, Lock Haven will participate in a program of exchange, campus cultural activities, and curriculum development to include Japanese/American interrelationships. Japanese students will come to each member institution. In all, 137 courses focus primarily on foreign countries and international concerns, and international elements have been incorporated in many other courses.

In 1975 a Latin American area studies program was approved and in 1977 a B.A. in International Studies was introduced. The Latin America program has been strengthened through the Argentina program, the OAS internship program and participation in the Pennsylvania Consortium of International Education program in Mexico. The International Studies major is interdisciplinary. Concentrations include such topics as international technical sales as well as the more traditional courses, and also permits students to concentrate on such areas as population, pollution, energy and business.

LHSC has two programs in Argentina. (a) The Visitors program, in operation since 1975, which brings Argentinian scholars to study both English language and their majors for two months. 25 have arrived to date but only one American has gone to Argentina. Plans are being made to develop the program into a more reciprocal exchange. (b) The Master Teacher Program is an agreement between AASCU and the Province of Buenos Aires to acquaint Argentinian teachers with educational programs in the U.S. LHSC is lead institution for this program, with 28 teachers coming to date. All expenses are paid by the Buenos

Aires government.

Under the terms of a Toyota grant to the PCIE, two Japanese students will come to each member institution, there will be symposia, lectures, performances, workshops and curriculum development related to Japan over the next two years.

Community and Campus Extra-Curricular Activities: The college, with its emphasis on international activities, has had a strong effect on the campus, as well as the entire community. Foreign student participants are seen as a source of enrichment. Through the host family program for foreign students, the impact of people from other cultures is considerably widened. Increasingly, college administrators notice that the community's interest in international activities is rising. The use of foreign students and faculty as interpretors, translators, tutors and resource people, and the encouragement from the college to accept speaking engagements with community groups and public schools have contributed to the public's increasing awareness.

Well publicized events such as "A Night in India" featuring Indian music, dance, costume and foods were especially well-received. Both the local Rotary Club and Chapter of AAUW have adopted the foreign students as their "sister community". The local music club has had an African night and international dinners and symposia have been held.

Contacts have been made with the local business community, especially with those companies with international interest, such as Piper Aircraft, whose executives serve on the LHSC Board of Trustees, and as a service, faculty provide interpretor/translating services to international business visitors.

An International Careers Conference was held, at which careers in business, government and education were discussed.

Structure: The international activities are administered by the Director in the Office of International Education, which has a broad based International Education advisory committee.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

The international education program at VPI&SU provides an outstanding example of the virtues of comprehensive institutional planning and administration aimed at integrating an international dimension of research, services and teaching. Based on a policy statement which defines the university's goals, the University organization and administration is designed to give maximum institutional support to international education activities and ensures their maximum and multifaceted impact on campus. Institutionally based exchange is a prominent and effective part of the overall strategy.

Founded in 1872 as a Land-Grant college, VPI&SU is now one of the comprehensive public universities in the Commonwealth of Virginia. VPI&SU has a strong record of accomplishment in international involvement in research, teaching and extension. The impact of this activity is increasingly felt on campus, particularly through the coordination and direction provided by the President, the University Committee on International Programs and the Office of University International Programs, directed by Robert Dyck. A policy statement committing the University to international teaching, research and service was adopted by the University in 1976 and has since served as a model for other institutions.

Entitled Statement on the Future Scope and Direction of of International Programs of VPISU, it clearly defines the benefits of international education to the institution as follows:

> Development of international expertise at the University will serve as an important base of knowledge and experience to be provided to the rapidly increasing needs of Virginia's public and private institutions. International involvement also provides opportunities for professional development of both faculty and students, and, as such, is useful in attracting faculty and enhancing the employment opportunities for our graduating students.

Faculty Development: In addition to opportunities provided by technical assistance programs, faculty members have the opportunity to do research and teach overseas as part of various agreements with foreign institutions. The University's College of Business has signed two faculty exchange agreements with Polish institutions--Warsaw Technical University and the Oskar Lange Academy of Economics. A five year faculty exchange agreement has been signed with the Federal University of Santa Catarina in Brazil for work in the fields of agricultural sciences and rural development. Several other programs are in the planning stages, including one involving the Mathematics Department of VPI and that of the University of Munich, and exchanges with universities in Australia and Brazil. In all, during the 1977-78 academic year, approximately 60 VPI faculty assisted in research or delivered papers overseas.

Curriculum Content: The increasing importance of international studies on campus reflects both an overall administrative emphasis on international education, as well as the impact of VPI's commitment to international development. This is demonstrated in the International Studies Program, established ten years ago, which includes courses on culture, history, language and political science, as well as economics and world problems. The program, which enrolls more than fifty students annually, depends on faculty from cooperating departments, many of whom are also involved in technical assistance.

Faculty are encouraged to include international components in course work, so that curriculum offerings now include such courses as urbanization in developing countries, international communications, international accounting, etc. Language training is being specifically targeted to fulfill VPI's need for Spanish, Portuguese and French competence in technical assistance programs.

Foreign Students: The number of international students at VPI has increased steadily and numbers about 500 from 70 countries. Of these, 61% were graduate students.

Community Impact: VPI has been particularly successful in including the surrounding community, business organizations and state agencies in its international interests. The University, through its Office of University International Programs and the College of Business, co-sponsored two Piedmont-Southwest Virginia International Trade Seminars in Roanoke to emphasize the important place Virginia occupies in overseas trade (Virginia's shipping terminals at Hampton Roads are the largest coal handling facilities in the world) and to encourage and assist more Virginia companies to trade internationally.

This program is part of a long term strategy to build support in Virginia for VPI international programs, as is indicated in the following passage from a planning document.

> It regards the continuation and expansion of its international programs as necessary and integral parts

of its interest in academic excellence and its mission to serve the citizens of Virginia and the United States. However, the University community is aware that it can continue its international work only with the support of the people of Virginia. For this reason, a vigorous public information campaign, utilizing the resources of the Extension Division, is being contemplated as a cooperative effort with Virginia State University, Petersburg, Virginia. This campaign should demonstrate to various segments of the public the importance of the Commonwealth's international programs and especially of its work in developing countries, since, "in an interdependent world, these nations are increasingly important to the economic well-being of every American." (President Jimmy Carter)

A BIFAD strengthening grant will develop faculty foreign language competence, add faculty with international development specialties and contribute to the building of state support for international education.

Institutional Linkage: The University exchange and technical assistance relationships are based on the idea of reciprocity in planning and implementation. To quote from the planning document:

> In general, the thrust of University International Programs will be to build upon existing University expertise, program strengths, and international experience. The University wishes to broaden its involvement in those countries in which it has had prior experience, offering its additional capabilities as applicable, and it also wishes to enter into those international linkages which promise to facilitate institutional exchange and cooperation over sustained time periods.

VPI has had a fifteen-year relationship with Haiti where technical assistance programs have included nutrition outreach, agricultural research, production and management techniques, forestry, and radio communication. Projects, funded principally by USAID, have included opportunities for graduate student study in Haiti and faculty exchange.

In the Philippines, VPI has had an active program for over ten years, focusing on nutrition outreach. Funding has come from USAID and the current program has been jointly administered with the University of Saint Thomas and the National Nutrition Center. In addition to a full time faculty member, other VPI faculty have spent considerable time in the Philippines, and visitors from the Philippines have come to VPI.

In Uruguay, VPI is working as a member of a university consortium to provide technical advisors and participant training to an Agricultural Research and Technical Assistance Project with the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Uruguay. In addition to Tech, the consortium includes Michigan State University, Pennsylvania State University and Texas A & M University. Michigan State is the prime contractor and lead institution for project administration.

Sri Lanka: With Pennsylvania State University and Texas A & M, VPI has a seven year project with the Sri Lanka agriculture college. Included are advanced U.S. training for 38 faculty members who will come to the U.S. for advanced degrees. Eight VPI faculty will teach in Sri Lanka as well as plan outreach programs.

VPI's International Extension Program provides foreign visitors the opportunity to learn from local farmers and farm managers throughout the state. The University also participates in a Partners of the Americas program with Santa Catarina, Brazil, and in the International 4-H Youth Exchange Program.

Organization and Administration for the International Education program is set out in the University's policy document statement:

A systematic approach to development of University International Programs will result in strengthened overall University teaching, research, and public service programs. Therefore, the following actions are appropriate and necessary:

1. Strengthening the planning and evaluatory role, advisory to the University Administration, of the University Committee on International Programs.

2. Development of an external Advisory Council on University International Programs, to provide an opportunity for prominent leadership from the public sector, private industry and commerce, public service organizations, foundations, and alumni of the University to have input into the conduct of University International Programs.

3. Encouragement, facilitation and coordination of international programs conducted by the several units of the University through the Office of University International Programs.

4. Development of University policies and procedures to assure that incentive benefits accrue to the individuals, departments, and colleges participating in appropriate international activities.

5. Maintenance of an up-to-date inventory of faculty competence and experience related to international program opportunities.

6. Establishment of periodic communications to sponsors of international programs and University faculty concerning areas of mutual interest, including project plans, accomplishments, capabilities, and needs.

7. Development of broad-based, multi-disciplinary and inter-professional programs to address the pressing problems of the world.

8. Continuation and expansion, as appropriate, of the existing structure of University "Country Coordinators," to provide oversight of the various University projects which are undertaken in a given country.

9. Adjustment of University project overhead policies to assure greater support for international programs development within the University.

10. Development of University international travel reimbursement policies consistent with the purposes of this Position Paper.

11. Development of Library holdings, audio-visual materials, and computer files related to international programs.

Georgetown University

Turning to a selected aspect of international education--undergraduate exchange, the Study includes the example of Georgetown's newly inaugurated experiment in international linkages.

The Georgetown student exchange program is based on the institutional linkages principle. Initially providing for a one-for-one exchange of students, it is planned to lead to jointly designed academic programs and, indeed, this is already under discussion with German universities. The underlying assumption is that the cost of education is roughly equal from country to country, but the difference lies in who pays this cost. In most countries costs are nationally subsidized, while in the U.S. students bear a varying share, depending on whether they are enrolled in public or private institutions. This difference between U.S. and foreign systems presents problems in student exchanges because the foreign student in the U.S. must pay while the U.S. student abroad does not. As noted earlier, there is considerable foreign resentment of this inequity. There is also a widespread criticism that so many

U.S. study abroad programs fail to integrate students in the foreign environment.

The Georgetown experiment is designed to solve both problems. Participating students on both sides pay the going rate for tuition, room and board at their home institution and American students enroll in the foreign university program. Students pay the costs of travel and incidental expenses. The program will be based on signed, long term agreements with foreign universities. In the first year approximately 35 students on each side will be exchanged, with 100 exchangees the following year. Students from Georgetown and other District of Columbia universities may apply. The next step planned is to open the program to more U.S. institutions--including especially those with minority enrollment. This will be done to broaden the academic base to include programs unavailable at GU and in order to extend opportunity to a wide spectrum of American students.

The program was initially administered by Georgetown with support from ICA. Although concentrating on Europe at first, exchange with selected non-Western countries is planned. In the first year three or four students will be exchanged each way with each institution, with a maximum of about ten when the program is functioning. Countries where the program will first function are Germany, France, Belgium and the U.K. The German response is particularly enthusiastic and the government has proposed to fund travel costs for students enrolled in one-for-one exchange programs, provided they are based on written agreements extending for at least three years.

University of Michigan

Finally, the University of Michigan is turned to for its recent development of overall university policy for exchanges based on linkages. The Michigan policy review ran parallel to the Linkages Study over the last three years, and in the end its deliberations contributed improved focus for the Study's conclusions and recommendations.

With extensive experience in international programs, both on campus and in various forms of exchange, over the years the University of Michigan has developed a wide range of institutional resources that are effectively applied to international activities. A number of top ranked departments and professional schools have engaged in extensive international exchanges and have included large international components in their curricula. Nationally top ranked area studies centers provide the most comprehensive coverage of Asia (from East to West) found in any university, and include strong components covering the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and Western Europe. These centers are umbrella structures that facilitate teaching and research with an area focus. A number of research and training institutes such as the Center for Research on Economic Development and Institute for Social Research house international research projects and special training courses in social science and specialized technologies.

The University has recently engaged in an extensive reconsideration of its international academic exchanges. This reconsideration has involved discussions among university faculty in many disciplines and with varied experience and interest in international exchanges. The discussions extended beyond the University as well, including colleagues in the federal government, in professional associations and in universities and governments abroad. These discussions culminated in an international colloquium in May, 1978, focusing on the problems of developing more effective academic cooperation with third world universities.

These discussions led the University to identify the new direction for Michigan to pursue in exchange between nations and between national institutions and the rich rewards that can ensue from such partnerships. To quote from their policy document: "These partnerships should aim at two-way flows of faculty and students, and at collaborative work that will produce roughly equal benefits for all parties in the partnership."

Pilot Linkage Program: Michigan is now proposing a five-year pilot program to develop institutionalized patterns for international exchanges and has developed an administrative structure uniquely suited to its academic environment. The program will be a pilot program in that it will lead in three different ways.

1) First, the program will lead the University of Michigan to strengthen its activities in international exchanges. A concerted effort will be made to draw into exchanges areas of the University that have not traditionally been directly involved in international activities. By offering opportunities for

exchanges to a broader base within the University, the program will help to add to the numbers and disciplines involved. In addition, by articulating the principles of effective partnerships in international exchanges, the program will multiply current efforts by drawing existing international units into a more internally cohesive network. Finally, the program will lead the University to integrate more fully its external exchanges, its internal curriculum development and its outreach activities in international studies.

2) Second, the program will provide leads to others in the content of international programs. By identifying and filling important gaps in current thinking and action in international exchanges, the University can demonstrate the rich rewards available to American universities through extending the perceptions of activities that can effectively be included in international exchanges. These gaps in current efforts are seen to be in the areas of humanities and social sciences, as noted in a University planning document:

> "Many international exchange programs continue to place emphasis upon the transfer of science and technology. We believe the humanities, and to a lesser extent the social sciences, are being neglected. Many third world nations continue to look to U.S. universities as sources of modern science and technology. We do not believe this emphasis is misplaced, nor that it should be reduced in absolute magnitude. We do believe, however, that much more attention should be given to the humanities in international exchanges. Further, we do not believe that the sciences and humanities represent mutually exclusive areas of activity in a zero sum game. They are or often can be complementary, and where complementarities are not readily perceived, we believe there is good reason to give greater emphasis to the humanities in their own right.
>
> "In the humanities our relations with our third world colleagues are unquestionably reciprocal, and offer great potential for the immediate realization of mutual benefits in programming. Each member of the partnership knows the parent culture more deeply. If languages, art, architecture, music and dance are to be taught more effectively, both here and abroad, the reciprocal exchange of faculty is vitally necessary. Thus, exchanges in the humanities offer excellent prospects for enriching the academic programs of both U.S. and third world universities. In addition, given the rise of importance of the idea of

national identity, a focus on the humanities also offers greater potential for enriching mutual understandings with others in the third world.

"The social sciences represent an area of considerable ambivalence and ambiguity in international exchanges. On the one hand, U.S. technology of the social sciences is eagerly sought by third world scholars and governments. The complementarities with science, technology and economic development are often clear and promising. Further, there has in the past been considerable emphasis given to the social sciences, in part as a component in the technology flow for development. On the other hand, however, the social sciences have become areas of deep conflict between U.S. and third world institutions, leading to a great reduction in mutual trust and reciprocal exchanges. This conflict has arisen in part because of the past often highly exploitative, and non-partnership, forms of academic relations between U.S. and third world universities. American scholars did research abroad, but published, consulted and advised at home. Many third world colleagues began to see social science knowledge as power that was being drained outward to the U.S. In part, the conflict developed when social science technologies were misapplied, just as other science and technology could be misapplied. The call for "appropriate" technologies in production is thus matched by the call for "indigenous" technologies in the social sciences.

"The conflicts and the resulting reduction in social science exchanges will undoubtedly prove costly for both the U.S. and third world scholars. Each will develop more fully and effectively with the criticism and reformulation that will be demanded by interaction with the other. What is needed is not simply more emphasis on the social sciences, but a more sensitive tailoring of exchanges to take account of the sources of past conflicts, and to work out effective mechanisms for resolving those conflicts to the mutual benefit of all."

3) Third, the program will lead others in demonstrating the working of a specific structure. The structure proposed will continue to support the decentralized individual and unit initiative in maintaining high quality and high integrity in international exchanges. However, it will also provide a central capacity to respond to external initiatives and to encourage initiatives in areas of the university not tradi-

tionally involved in international exchanges.

The experiences developed in both content and structure can provide useful guidelines both for other universities and for federal and private funding agencies interested in meeting the current challenges of developing effective partnerships with third world universities.

Structure: The University proposes a new three-tiered structure that will assist the University to remain sensitive to external needs, to encourage and facilitate individual initiative in both traditional and non-traditional areas of international activity, and to provide the capacity to respond to external initiatives in international exchanges. The three tiers are briefly described as follows:

1. An international advisory committee, made up of a small number of foreign and American academic statesmen, will be created to meet with and advise the relevant university bodies on important conditions abroad.

2. A University international exchanges policy committee will be established to consider broad policy options in international exchange. This committee will be the focal point for the two part program of facilitating faculty initiatives both in areas of current international exchanges and in areas with interest but little past experience in such exchanges. The policy committee will seek and administer funds for international exchange activities that can be fully integrated into overall university programs of exchange, local curriculum development and outreach. Funding will be provided for project development and, on a matching basis, for long term programs.

3. At the operating level, area oriented executive committees will be established as they are needed. These committees will be composed of faculty familiar with a specific cultural or geographic area in which we have or expect to have a broad program of international exchanges. With faculty who have both area experience and roots in academic disciplines, these committees will have the capacity to provide specific guidance to faculty with interests in developing or strengthening international exchanges. They can both call for action in areas of special need, and help screen faculty proposals for university support

Using area oriented committees to help elicit and guide faculty initiative takes advantage of one of the major resources the University possesses in international exchanges. This is the personal knowledge and the personal contacts of the individual university staff, both faculty and academic administrators. Many faculty have built valuable knowledge of local situations and have trusted colleagues in areas in which effective exchanges can be developed. This provides for the sensitivity to local conditions on both sides of the potential partnership, which is indispensable for building effective and lasting relationships.

Institutional Integration of International Education

Campus international programs consist of at least three integral parts: international academic exchanges, research, internal development of curriculum, and outreach activities beyond the walls of the campus. Too often in the past, there was little integration of these three components. International exchanges or even development work abroad were isolated and had little impact on internal curriculum development. Outreach activity tended too often to be *ad hoc* and domestically oriented, benefitting little from the richness of international programming on campus or exchanges abroad.

The few partial exceptions in this integrative failure were more notable for their exceptional character than for their success in developing integrative links between various elements of international programs. CIES provides exchange scholars, with priority going to those programs that can best use others in their own internal programs. Unfortunately, there are very few exchanges available, and their scarcity mitigates against the long term commitment of exchange positions to one program.

Thus, a successful exchange is most likely to be single, more or less ad hoc or opportunistic success, rather than part of a longer term institutionalized program. Similarly, the Office of Education has directed that its NDEA supported Language and Area programs devote fifteen percent of their budgets to outreach activities. With no effective guidelines for how these funds should be used, and with the uncertain nature of the directive, this otherwise laudable move cannot assist much in integrating international curriculum development with outreach programming.

All three components of international programming can and should be more effectively integrated. This will imply that each will lead to the more effective development of the other. That is, the three components are not mutually exclusive activities. Like elements of the content of international programs, these program components can be strengthened simultaneously, producing a multiplying effect on the overall international program. Increasingly, as shown in the foregoing examples, campuses are recognizing the need for integration. There are impediments to this process. First, is the decentralized structure of U.S. higher education. Many campuses are successfully overcoming this obstacle through comprehensive planning and high level leadership. However, the external funding agencies too often exacerbate fragmentation of campus effort thoroughly because of their frequently narrow and conflicting purposes. To effectively integrate various elements of international education therefore requires special effort.

There is a growing consensus[4] that the key element in institutionalizing international education in colleges and universities are: (1) explicit institutional policy commitment to integrated international education and a strategy for achieving it; (2) strong interest and support of the president, administration, deans and department heads; (3) a critical mass of faculty with international interests and experience; (4) creation of an appropriate campus or system-wide administrative structure to coordinate and facilitate international education activities, and to advise on long term planning to integrate an international education strategy.

Policy Commitment: The first step towards an institutional policy commitment to international education is an overall assessment of the international dimensions of campus teaching, research, and service functions. Next comes the establishment of priorities for future development and strengthening. Study campus interviews indicate that this assessment process typically includes at least some of the following:

---

[4] These elements have been identified in a number of recent documents. See, among others, Audrey Gray, International/Intercultural Education in Selected State Colleges & Universities; K.L. Turb, Darl Snyder, J.T. Scott, Rationale for Involvement of Universities, International Education Research & Development, a SUDIAP Publication, No. 2; and James Cowan draft manuscript "Code of Practice for Universities Involved in International Activities".

1. Survey of faculty international experience and research interests. (Increasingly, these surveys are being published by universities--most recently the University of Illinois and Ohio State University.) 2. Review of research strengths, particularly interdisciplinary programs focused on problems significant to development. 3. Survey of curriculum to make centrally available a list of those courses having an explicit international content. 4. Survey of existing international activities. 5. Assessment of foreign language instruction, degree requirements, including courses offered, and their efficiency in producing spoken fluency. 6. Survey of international dimensions of extension and outreach. 7. Assessment of administrative framework and advance integration of an international education dimension. 8. Assessment of appointment, promotion, salary and leave policies and practice to assure that international teaching, research , and service will be recognized and rewarded.

This assessment of international education not only helps identify strengths and weaknesses, the process itself is a helpful exercise, stimulating debate.

This assessment must be initiated at the highest administrative level. Strong presidential support is the one vital element for developing an integrated institutional international education commitment. Presidents may often doubt that they have any influence on the direction of their institutions, but the evidence is strong that their commitment to internationalizing is the key to achieving it. Armed with it, a cadre of internationalists have essential leverage to move their departments and schools.

The assessment of campus programs should lead to discussion of overall priorities based on identified strengths and weaknesses and the particular institutional mission. Without priorities, international activities are undertaken on a random basis, contributing little to overall institutional needs while draining resources. Given presidential commitment, support of administrators and deans must often be built and is often advanced through the process of assessment and policy development. Greatest resistance to internationalization would occur at the departmental levels, where battles over resource allocation, teaching loads, professional rewards, etc. are fought out. The existance of an expressed institutional policy and high level administrative leadership for international education can make the difference at this level.

Advisory Committee: Also helpful is the creation of a campus wide faculty advisory committee for international education. Its purpose is to work with the administration in development of policy and program implementation and evaluation. This contributes to integration and maximizing impacts of programs and provides an essential institution wide communications system focused on international education matters. At institutions having area and international studies, the committee structure is one of the rare means of bringing area and disciplinary representatives together.

Central Coordination: The foregoing examples of international education show the diversity of funding sources to which campuses must turn for support of international education activities. To be able to take full advantage of the bewildering array of funders, campuses are finding it necessary to create a central source of coordination and development for international activity. The administrative home for this function varies but more and more institutions lodge it with a director of international programs who is usually full time and has an academic appointment. Ideally, the appointment is at a sufficiently high level to have direct access to the president. At Wisconsin, with its extensive international programs and budget, it is proposed to name a vice chancellor for international programs for the Madison campus.

An office of international programs is not feasible for many smaller campuses or those newly expanded in international activities. For them, part of the information and development function is undertaken by their national associations, but the coordination provided by an interdisciplinary committee or appointed coordinator can do much to further international initiatives.

Consortia: Consortia are of increasing importance in interin international education and many examples were cited in the foregoing examples, most of which focus on technical assistance activities. They can also be a creative force for campus international education, as shown by the Southern California Conference for International Studies. Because resources of expertise and finance are particularly scarce in international education, sharing them more widely becomes essential. Increasingly, the area and language study centers are serving as regional resources, providing a variety of educational services to neighboring colleges and universities as centers improve outreach to schools and the community

Particular note should be taken of the profound impact of technical assistance activities on the development of campus international education programs. The examples of the University of Wisconsin, Virginia State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, North Carolina A & T University indicate the degree to which institutions are involved in teaching, research, and service in the developing world and how these activities can be made an integral part of a strategy for internationalization. Providing overseas experience for faculty and students, and incentives for developing long term competence, curriculum development and campus outreach.

Much of the technical assistance activity is conducted through linkages to LDC institutions. As will be seen in the next section, this is the mode preferred by foreign academics and administrators, and it is most effective in achieving the goal of LDC self sufficiency. Institutional linkages also offer distinct advantages to U.S. campuses not just for technical assistance but also for academic exchange (e.g. the University of Michigan) and student exchange (e.g. Georgetown University). The final section of this report will return to the subject of linkages, discussing in greater detail their advantages as additional vehicles for international education.

IV. Foreign Academic Perspective on U.S. Cooperation

The main focus of the Linkages Study's work was its review of foreign interest in and need for cooperation with U.S. postsecondary education. An extended discussion of this question has been presented in the final report. A brief review of the findings is presented here with some additional comment relating to proposals for linkages programs.

Developed World

Western Europe: This study, with limited resources and primary focus on the developing world, could not give American-European academic relations the attention they deserve. Brief visits to six countries, coupled with review of limited elements of exchange referred to earlier, have led to the disquieting conclusion that despite prevailing complacency, our academic relations with Europe are in decline as a result of American short-sightedness and not because cooperation is not welcomed by the Europeans. Quite to the contrary, Europeans do want more interaction and their governments are prepared to subsidize much of the cost.

Not only is there a decline in the total number of American grantees going to Europe, but in addition to cuts in the number of grantees under the Fulbright program, tight budgets have also taken their toll programatically.In France, duration of research grants is often limited to two to three months, and the number of U.S. grantees may be cut in order to make more grants to younger academics whose stipends are lower. Many of the binational commissions have had to make tough decisions to drop certain programs altogether and are unable to expand or respond adequately to changing patterns on the education scene, such as the rising interest in the U.S. community college system, the current emphasis on vocational, adult and continuing education, etc.

Even in science, where funding for collaborative research and exchange is generally considered adequate, a trend toward decline in transatlantic collaboration may be discernible. Although a detailed analysis of the number of scientists going overseas and coming to the U.S. is not available, recent research done by Dorothy S. Zinberg of the Program for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University[5] is suggestive. Its preliminary findings show a decrease in the amount of funding for projects involving collaboration with scientists in Europe, coupled with a strong feeling among Europeans that American scientists are becoming increasingly isolated. In addition, the study shows a striking decrease in the number of first-year postdoctoral fellows in basic science spending a year in overseas laboratories, a drop of 40 percent since 1971. All but three of the European laboratories included in the Harvard survey reported a decline in the number of American postdoctoral fellows.

The decline in support for Western European exchange opportunities has not only resulted in cutbacks to established programs, it also means lost opportunities to explore with European educators common experiences and innovative programming which has been developed on both continents over the past decade. For instance, in both the U.S. and in Europe, the past ten years have seen increased emphasis on non-traditional students and on vocational and technical education, and there is now an increasing desire for exchange of information and collaboration in joint projects. In the United States, many community colleges are anxious to work with European counterparts as they develop their own programs; in the United Kingdom the polytechnics are seeking ways of increasing their participation in the traditional flow of educational cooperation between our two countries; in Germany the need is strong for assistance in training educational planners and administrators for vocational training. Yet this area of education has not fallen within the traditional bounds of the Fulbright program.

---

[5] Dorothy S. Zinberg, "Planning for Contraction: Changing Trends in Travel Patterns of American and European Scientists." Prepared for "Workshop on New U.S. Initiatives in International Science and Technology," April 13-16, 1977, Keystone, Colorado.

There is also a need and interest to extend the range of exchange programs to include a more representative participation of American faculty and institutions in appropriate matches with European counterparts. This is both understood and welcomed by Europeans who seek deeper understanding of our society and more accurate appreciation of their own, which extends beyond the major institutions and metropolitan centers.

There is a need for a program of sustained institutional interaction for the pursuit of common educational purposes, both between major research institutions and between other sectors of postsecondary education. There are already strong signs of European interest in developing this kind of relationship. In the United Kingdom the Universities Transatlantic Exchanges Committee was established in October '77, to provide a mechanism whereby institutions wishing to form relationships with North American institutions might benefit from the knowledge and experience of those involved in programs already operating. Last available information showed 15 universities in the United Kingdom affiliated, and it is expected that the British polytechnics will soon be included in UTEC membership.

In France, the U.S.-Franco Commission is already funding linkages between French and American institutions with a remarkably broad range of institutions receiving support.

This is a welcome development, reflecting the model of institutional cooperation this Study is recommending. However, the use of scarce Fulbright funds for such arrangements is cause for concern.

The decline in our capacity to meet old obligations and stimulate new cultural contacts comes at a critical time on both sides of the Atlantic.

Japan: Finally, no survey of links to Japan was possible, but given the importance of U.S. relations with this nation, a review of our academic relationships is overdue. Campus interviews reveal few sustained programs.

Communist World

Extended analysis of American academic relations with the communist world was beyond the scope of this Study. Exchanges with the U.S.S.R. are governed by complex intergovernmental agreements which reflect prevailing political realities, limiting their scope. Expansion of activity in this area should not be a priority at this time, though expanded academic institutional relations with these countries should be a long-term objective, and the academic community should be alert to new opportunities as political relationships evolve.

In Eastern Europe discussions with university rectors, faculty, and government officials revealed an increasing interest in academic cooperation. Many educational agreements already exist as demonstrated by the approximately 25 arrangements between American institutions and the University of Warsaw in Poland, where long-term institutional agreements between universities is becoming the preferred model for cooperation. A successful linkage between Lock Haven State College, Pennsylvania, and Maria Curie Sklodowska University in Poland is the largest exchange program with a Polish university in the U.S. In the fall of 1977 ten American students and three professors took part in an exchange with an equal number of Polish students and professors.

China: The opening up of cultural relations with the People's Republic of China has been long awaited by U.S. campuses. It is to be hoped that the linkage model of exchange will be a part of the overall pattern of interaction between the two countries.

The Third World

A recent University of Michigan planning document puts forth a case for American academic relations with the developing world:

> Academic relations with third world universities stand at a critical turning point. In the past, these relations were often marked by deep inequities, derived in part from the narrow "development orientation" that dominated the very definition of the third world. Third world hopes for rapid economic development typically implied extensive attempts to transfer modern technologies from the rich to the poor countries. U.S. universities became deeply involved in the pervasive western effort to promote economic development through technology transfers. The definition of the third world as technologically inferior implied that the only possible relations were those in which the U.S. universities gave and others received. Mutual benefits, if they developed at all, were only an incidental by-product of such relations.
>
> We have now entered a new era in which those old perceptions and orientations are no longer accurate, useful, or acceptable. That we have entered a new era is evident from a variety of directions. In the third world and in the U.S., in governments and universities, there is currently a ferment of activity attesting to rising perceptions of new situations that present problems of institutional adjustment and potentials of great benefit if these adjustments are effective.
>
> In the third world there is the recognition of a continued need for the transfer of capital and technology from the richer nations, but this has been tempered by at least two major changes. One is reflected in the demand for a New International Economic Order, which implies the need for institutional changes that increase

> equality in the world distribution of wealth. The other is reflected in the concept of appropriate technologies. This implies that needs in the third world are for technologies different from those in the richer nations. The more profound implication of this recognition lies in the need to be more conscious of and sensitive to the critical interrelations between science and technology on the one hand and the varieties of human institutions on the other. Both thrusts demand that we develop greater understanding of the relationship between human institutions and the technologies of production. In particular, this poses profound problems for which universities throughout the world have a distinctive opportunity to engage in their basic tasks of pushing out the frontiers of human understanding in partnership with one another.

Growth: The most striking fact about higher education in the developing world is its growth and maturation over the past twenty years. This is measured both in the numbers of students and the establishment of new institutions.

In Africa, for example, there were four institutions of higher education prior to 1950, while today there are more than 60. In Latin America there are now at least a thousand public and private institutions of higher learning with the proportion of university-aged youth receiving some form of academic training more than doubling during the 1960s. In Brazil alone, enrollments in institutions of higher learning increased from 93,000 in 1963 to almost 2,000,000 in 1976; in 1976 there were 984 separate institutions of higher learning; from 1966 through 1975 graduate degree programs grew from 26 to 490 for the master's degree and from 10 to 183 for the doctorate.

In Asia, the institutional growth is equally impressive, and there are more than 50 problem focused research institutions. Indonesia has 300 postsecondary institutions. The Middle East has the world's oldest university, Al Azhar in Cairo, and the oil-rich states of the region have vigorously pursued institution building, with many universities established and more to come.

The colonial past of many LDCs has, of course, significantly affected the structure and orientation of their postsecondary education. In the colonial and early post-colonial period, postsecondary institutions were staffed largely by expatriates; they were often modeled directly on metropolitan universities, maintaining standards of academic equivalency to them and reproducing their curricula. Early indigenous staff was trained at the metropolitan center. (Historically, France, the U.K. and others based much of their technical assistance on institutional linkages. For a brief period in the 1960s, the U.S. used this approach but soon abandoned it.)

However, few examples of this model exist today. Most countries are self sufficient in training undergraduates and are moving rapidly to provide advanced training, and there are also many specialized research institutions of the first rank. Academic leadership is shifting to a new generation, often trained as undergraduates at home, and many with U.S. degrees. Large-scale expatriate staffing will be the exception by the end of this century. For the most part, it is now only a stop-gap to underpin rapid expansion.

Diversification: Accompanying the growth in numbers of institutions, there is increasing diversification of orientation and function: 1) On the one hand are institutions defining their roles as principally teaching and research. In every region there are established, world class universities with internationally recognized faculty. 2) Emerging too are more activist institutions, often comprehensive in scope, located away from urban centers and more oriented to regional needs. They undertake outreach programs and applied research of great variety as part of their service function.

3) A third type is the degree- or certificate-granting, specialized institutions for teacher education, agriculture, and technology and the non-degree training institutions geared to produce special and lower-level skills in graduates. This diversity is significant for U.S. academic exchange because it is matched by the diversity of U.S. higher education, thus offering new opportunities for mutually beneficial relations for the full range of our institutions.

The Interest in Cooperation with U.S. Institutions

The interest in strengthening ties between the American academic community and institutions in developing countries is a two-way process. There is a demonstrable growth of U.S. interest in relationships with LDCs, but the growth of the developing country interest is even more dramatic. They have taken the initiative in seeking to strengthen such ties. The size, diversity, excellence in many fields, innovation in educational philosophy, and practice of U.S. higher education lead overseas educators to want sustained contact with the U.S. system. As the Study representative to Egypt puts it, "Egyptians are for linkages almost to the point a people is for motherhood." Earlier American programs of exchange, training, and assistance have added to the demand. There are ample illustrations drawn from the Study to demonstrate a readiness in all parts of the developing world for increased contact with the U.S. academic community. In much of the developing world, for both historical and practical reasons, the preferred mode of international academic cooperation is based on long-term institutional agreements.

Declining U.S. Contact with LDCs

The most acute shortfall in American international academic relations is with middle-income and AID graduate countries.[6]

In countries such as India, Brazil, Nigeria, Egypt, and many others, there are highly developed research institutions where research significant to our own disciplinary scholarship is in progress. Their distinctive cultural and historical heritage is the focus of U.S. area specialists' research, which requires continuous interaction with the growing indigenous centers of interdisciplinary area research.

Many of these are important nations where we have significant investments and need access to their natural resources. We want their political support. They need continued technical assistance, especially on the educational side, to develop practical research and applications, to enlarge their pools of skilled manpower, to introduce new technology, and to improve the lot of their poorest citizens.

Despite the growing third world demand for educational cooperation with the United States, that supported by technical assistance has sharply declined and often disappeared over the past decade. In addition, U.S. exchange programs have been too limited to have much impact. As a result, policy shifts, declining budgets, and inflationary pressures have combined to seriously jeopardize our educational relations which, in any case, have long given priority to agriculture and other technical fields.

Of central importance to the Study was the solicitation of opinion from academics, education administrators, and political leaders concerning constraints to successful relationships in the past, ways in which ties might be improved and strengthened and, in particular, the areas of strength they would like to tap in American higher education.

---

[6] Among others, Trinidad and Tobago, Argentina, Iran, Iraq, Barbados, Malta, Mexico, Cyprus, Brazil, Fiji, Republic of China, Turkey, Algeria, Chile, Malaysia, Angola, Mauritius, Colombia, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Ivory Coast and Congo (Brazzaville) have been "graduated by AID.

(1) The frequent absence of genuine collaboration has very often resulted in programs which have lacked a clearly defined purpose and have been without mutual benefits and commitment of resources. Projects planned on an individual-to-individual basis have not been a part of, or complementary to, overall university or departmental planning, so that the program leaves little impact on the institution. Program planning in this context has led to frustrated expectations as students coming to the U.S. to study according to the agreement find principal faculty unable to give them sufficient attention, or the courses they have come to study are not refocused to respond to their country's environment or particular problems. There are complaints, too, that once the agreement is signed, U.S. institutions will permit weaker or ill-prepared faculty to participate in the program, contrary to expectations. In some cases, they have contracted outside personnel.

(2) Projects have been too highly specialized or narrowly defined, often by outside consultants who give contradictory advice, and some lack relevance to LDC objectives. In contrast to other bi-national experience, American participants were cited for having a purely planning role with little contribution to later implementation. As one Kuwaiti put it, "U.S. higher education is very good on planning and advising ... but we need help in implementing all the good advice and plans." Some commented that project participants often lacked experience in the particular environment in which they would be working, such as agricultural or engineering projects cited by one Afghani educator, with insufficient orientation on the political,

cultural, and physical environment.

(3) Programs contained no provision for a winding-down period or for follow-up visits or joint projects. Most educators interviewed agreed that sustained ties on a more formal basis than former colleagues exchanging correspondence would be desirable, both to assist in subsequent implementation and for continued training of staff.

(4) Those interviewed insisted that institutional linkages must be on an academic-to-academic basis rather than government-to-government agreements. Residual suspicion persists that U.S. government agencies act as fronts for intelligence activities; administrators and faculty expressed concern that students can seriously hinder relationships on this basis. Where linkages are to reflect mutual benefit and trust, then the academic framework is preferred. There is a great frustration too at government bureaucracy. Lacking an educational structure to which to turn, many prefer doing without rather than dealing with government agencies.

(5) A major impediment to links with American higher education is its diversity and the lack of a centralized point of access or even source of information. Many stated that an inappropriate match with a U.S. institution had often resulted from inadequate information.

(6) Recruitment of U.S. faculty for short- or long-term service in LDCs presents a special problem, as has most recently been seen in the Nigerian case. Overseas educators expressed a need for a centralized channel to make staffing needs known in a manner more effective than direct media advertising.

(7) Imbalance: LDC educators particularly stressed the imbalance in the limited program of U.S. technical assistance to educational institutions. Fluctuation in assistance policy has made long-term planning impossible. In sharp contrast to French

and British policy, there are no readily perceivable programs of U.S. support for academic cooperation in most disciplines and professions.

LDC Suggestions for Strengthening Future Relationships

In any form of human endeavor, there is always room for improvement, and academic relationships are no exception. But it should be noted that past problems associated with contractual ties have not soured those in the developing nations or the U.S. Quite the contrary. It has helped those in the LDCs to sharpen their views on the type of arrangements they would like to see in the future. The interviews conducted in both the least developed as well as middle-income countries reflect a rather clear set of general characteristics LDC leaders would like to see:

Reciprocity

Overseas educators overwhelmingly agreed that the basic element in linkage arrangements must be reciprocity, that the idea of an arrangement being a one-way street no longer applied to the majority of institutions in the modern setting. Along with the desire for reciprocity goes a need for detailed joint planning before universities enter into an arrangement. Agreements should be practical, should not try to achieve too much. And again, agreements must stress the substantive content of the project with less attention to "prestige labels." In the words of Dr. Hamed Zahedi, Secretary General of the Iranian Central Council of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education, "With reference to linkages, we would like to establish reciprocity, we believe in the two-way street ..." Vice Chancellor Kwakye, University of Science and Technology, Ghana stated that:

> The time has come when university relationships should no longer contain traces of the donor-receiver mentality. Universities in the developing world are now ready to

> enter into equal relationships with their counterparts in the developed countries, and are seeking to join in mutually beneficial cooperative projects.

Wherever physically possible, university administrators consider their own university contribution to a linkage arrangement as an integral component. This would include housing for faculty, local salary, and, in some cases, transport. But the need for a strong initial agreement at the department level was stressed many times. Relationships which start at the top administrative level and are carried through without strong department support have never been as successful as those that arise from a desire for a working relationship between professors in the same field working on a project of mutual interest.

Continuity

The need for continuity as an essential element was expressed many times during the field study. This was especially emphasized by Southeast Asian educators where, with few exceptions, most of the arrangements of the last 15-20 years in this area have been terminated. While some informal arrangements have been continued, most of the relationships no longer exist, much to the distress of the educators and even government people involved with educational enterprises. There was tremendous interest in finding some way of not only continuing past relationships, but also in building new ones.

Conversely, there was strong reaction to "quick shot" action projects, very few of which could feasibly be completed in the stipulated time-frame and which would then leave no provision for follow-up monitoring of project process, evaluation, or continued staff training. To be worthwhile, project agreements must contain a strong element of institutional commitment on both sides, so that successful relationships at the departmental level can continue in the knowledge that administrators have at the outset concluded a long-term agreement to support the project.

Improved Access

Another theme almost unanimously emphasized by many was the need to improve access to the wide diversity of American institutions. Sophisticated as many are concerning the U.S. system, knowledge is often limited to 10-20 universities, those that have been most active in international programs. Overseas educators are now becoming increasingly aware of the value of relationships with many of the state colleges and universities, with the community colleges, and the wide array of consortia which have varying areas of expertise in research, training, and community service programs to draw on. While they rightly reserve the selection to themselves, the need a central point of entry and a source of expert neutral advice.

Collaborative Research, Staff Development and Curriculum Strengthening:

Either as a direct purpose of the linkage arrangement or as a by-product, many educators expressed the need for jointly designed research. The best established institutions want fully equal relationships to keep staff involved in international scholarship while newer ones need to upgrade staff research competence.

The urgent need for staff development and faculty upgrading through exchange was constantly repeated. In Mexico closer ties with U.S. technical institutes and assistance with training professors to teach technical instructors were mentioned. In Zambia, where 75 percent of faculty are expatriates from more than 30 countries, the Vice Chancellor of the University of Zambia stated, "The top priority for us is staff development through training abroad." In Lesotho, only 20 percent of staff is local and there is a great need for expatriates, especially from the U.S. In the Sudan staff development programs produced 500 Ph.D.s but the brain drain to oil-rich countries requires a renewed effort to train staff. In Egypt, faculty in the applied science fields is a priority. In Afghanistan, teachers of English are needed as are faculty for technical/vocational programs, agriculture, engineering, and the basic sciences. In Argentina, advanced training for teachers (of which 37 are already in the U.S.) is a priority.

Advanced training for junior staff is needed and here shorter-term non-degree or joint degree programs are desired in addition to formal degree programs. In a linkage arrangement staff can take selected course work at a U.S. institution but research and other course work would be done in the home country. Such arrangements both improve the relevance of training , reduce costs, and are less likely to produce brain drain than random placement.

Apart from the obvious need for more trained staff, overseas educators expressed their concern that their faculty members not become isolated, that they have a need for outside contact, not only to keep abreast with new developments in their fields, but also to participate in the international academic environment. This becomes more of a reality as undergraduates are increasingly trained in their own countries. Planned participation in international networks is important to ensure exposure to intellectual and technological development as well as to foster mutual understanding and respect.

The Fulbright Exchange was seen as having minimal impact on institutional development in the non-Western world because of its limited scope, lack of reciprocity and absence of continuity.

Curriculum Development. The development of relevant curriculum is an interrelated process with the emphasis shifting from non-indigenous to indigenous content as local experience and research is accumulated through action and pure and applied research and analysis. American experience is often seen as relevant in that we have a more flexible tradition of teaching and research design responsible to local circumstances. Two examples are:

> Argentina has sent 37 teachers from the Province of Buenos Aires to U.S. state colleges and universities for individualized and specialized training to last several months. Funded by the Province, the teachers are expected on their return to assume positions of leadership in the school system. Major emphasis will be on curriculum reform, and also on the use of media, development of instructional materials, etc. Principal priorities in the Argentinian program to upgrade education are rural education, urban education, special education, agricultural education, secondary and tertiary education, and supervisory techniques.
>
> Basic undergraduate curriculum reform in the humanities and social sciences was undertaken on a national basis by the Indonesian government with teams of Indonesian educators working at the University of Hawaii, the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Wisconsin. Their purpose was to alter the focus to concentrate on the Indonesian scene, developing case materials and examples, integrating information developed through recent research.

Conclusion: Desire for increased interaction with American postsecondary education was found in both the developed and developing world. In Western Europe there is a discernible decline in U.S. involvement in exchange, and present programs do not adequately reflect the institutional diversity on both sides.

The most acute problem is in U.S. academic relations with the third world where the total amount and nature of interaction is inadequate both from the perspective of its needs and the U.S. need to know about these regions. In the national interest and in the interests of internationalizing U.S. higher education, the program of academic interchange must be greatly expanded in quantity, in breadth and in quality. Examination of past LDC relationships with the U.S. suggests that the preferred model of cooperation is through long-term, mutually beneficial institutional agreements.

V. Conclusion

Institutional Linkages: An Additional Means of Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education

The Study concludes that mutually beneficial institutional linkages between U.S. and foreign postsecondary institutions functioning at the departmental level make a vital contribution to comprehensive campus international education programs. They meet foreign needs, particularly in developing countries, for cooperative academic relationships and provide U.S. campuses the opportunity to develop and enhance their international perspective in teaching, research and service, both on campus and overseas. They do so at relatively less cost since they rely on mutual institutional investment.

The failure of the Linkages Study proposal to create a national program of financial support for campus international linkage programs to be funded by federal agencies and private foundations is, of course, disappointing. But there are diverse sources of funding in the federal government, through foreign governments and international organizations. Although locating support from these varied sources is difficult, institutions are successfully doing so. The likelihood is that institutionally focussed exchange--because it works and is economical--will become the preferred means of U.S. participation in international academic cooperation during the coming years. Eventually more adequate funding will be available to support a wider range of linkages than possible today.

In the meantime, this Study presents its definition of linkages, discusses their advantages and presents successful linkage criteria useful for campus and for potential funders.

Linkages Defined: The term "linkages" has acquired a variety of meanings. Linkages are defined by this Study as direct operational ties, arrived at through mutual agreement, providing mutual benefit, and requiring mutual investment of resources. Tutelage is rejected as a style of operation; instead emphasis is on mutuality and collaboration. Linkages may occur between institutions as a whole or groups of institutions (consortia). Most often, ties will be at the departmental and multi-disciplinary interdepartmental level.

Design: The design of linkages can be important as content and requires systematic attention. Some principles of this design include:

Tailored Programming: All elements in a relationship should be sensitively tailored to take account of local needs and conditions in both LDC and U.S. universities. Persons with knowledge of the area and the line faculty who will perform most of the work should be directly involved in the planning. Programs cannot be mass produced in standardized fashion, nor can they be planned by persons unfamiliar with the specific area, or by persons who will not bear a major responsibility for the actual work of the program.

Planning in Partnership: Programs of academic relations should be planned and directed jointly by faculty and administrators from all partners in the project. This will ensure that programming will reflect the specific needs and conditions of both sides and that mutual benefits will accrue from the relationships.

Mutual Benefits: Programs should be planned to provide benefits to all members of the partnership in rough equality. Many LDC universities have as much to contribute to U.S. international studies as U.S. universities have to contribute abroad. Realizing the potentials of mutual benefits will require active two-directional flows of both students and faculty. This implies that U.S. universities must develop new and more extensive opportunities for scholars from LDC's to play active roles, both on campus and in outreach programs.

Long Term Programming: Academic relations should be planned for the long term, covering a number of years, to permit the full development of lasting collegial and institutional networks. This demands that institutions accept considerable responsibility on entering into academic relations, and that resources be committed for substantial periods.

Criteria for Successful Linkage: The forgoing analysis of linkage design, published material,[7] evaluation of foreign linkage programs and U.S. and foreign institutional experience has led to the development of the following general criteria for linkages. To be successful institutional linkages should:

1) begin with a clear definition of mutual advantage;
2) define specific purposes and develop a coherent plan for their achievement in a written agreement;
3) involve the faculty fully in planning;
4) demonstrate institutional commitment in the form of support at key administrative levels that assure conformance to overall institutional priorities (existence of an institutional policy and program for international education might be considered a prerequisite);
5) provide for institutional financial investment which would normally include salaries and omit consulting fees and administrative costs;
6) offer evidence of adequate and appropriate academic resources; and
7) provide for independent evaluation of progress at regular intervals.

Experience also suggests that initial exploration of linkage must include site visits on both sides and a period of negotiation which includes an extensive exchange of information.

---

[7] Report, page 160.

Content of Links: The key to a successful linkage program is flexibility of response. Linkages involve some of the following elements: exploratory visits and negotiations; exchange of senior staff for short-term academic work and advisement; exchange of junior staff for advanced training (this may or may not include work toward a formal degree); research and training opportunities for graduate students; exchange of undergraduates; longer-term teaching assignments on a planned basis; joint faculty appointments and jointly designed and conducted degree granting programs; exchange of teaching and research materials and publications; joint or parallel research and action projects; seminars, workshops or conferences to share knowledge; and training of technicians.

Benefits of Institutional Linkages: As demonstrated by the earlier presented examples of campus international education programs, campuses of all types are developing direct linkages with foreign counterparts. These linkages have their greatest beneficial impact on international programs when they are part of comprehensive planning for internationalization. Indeed, they contribute to comprehensive planning because of their long term nature and requirement for institutional investments of manpower and finance. However, even for institutions now developing an international education role, linkages offer opportunities for faculty development through direct foreign experience.

Reviewing some selected segments of international education, the Study has found that international linkages can offer some solutions to problems encountered in current efforts.

Faculty Exchanges: The principal program supporting faculty exchange is the Senior Fulbright Program. The problem is that opportunities under this program have declined in total number, frequently in duration, and in terms of the financial support provided. It is estimated that this decline in real dollars has cut the program by half over the last decade. Increasingly, the program is dependent on institutional contributions in the form of sabbatical leave salaries without which probably a majority of faculty could not accept Fulbright awards.

While striving to maintain credible numbers for the program, resources have been stretched thin and financial awards have not kept pace with the U.S. rate of inflation, often worse inflation overseas, and faculty base salaries which have also failed to keep up with inflation (average annual increase has been 4.7% annually in 1975-6 and 1976-77).

The Fulbright program policy is to give overseas experience to American faculty from all regions in all fields and increasingly to nonacademic professionals. For American faculty particularly in the social sciences and humanities it is often the only means of getting first hand foreign experience. There are roughly 600,000 faculty based in nearly 3,000 institutions. Yet there are about 500 American grantees annually.

Community college faculty have virtually no avenues available for exchanges under the present programs, and private colleges and newer state universities are underrepresented, this despite the fact that these institutions together enroll three-quarters of all undergraduates and are therefore a vital avenue to reaching new and often the most parochial of our citizenry.

A major inequity of the Fulbright program is that the number of foreign grantees coming to the U.S. is nearly double the number of American grantees going abroad. In addition, most of the American grantees go as lecturers and not for research. These inequities reduce the program's effective contribution to international studies and to campus international education programs.

An additional problem is that the largest share of Fulbright exchange is with the developed countries. In 1977 there were only 50 American grantees in the whole of sub-Sahara Africa, in Latin America 59, and in Asia 109. While there have been increases for non-Western areas since then, they do not begin to meet the need for involvement with the many highly developed educational institutions of the non-Western world.

The Fulbright program is an indispensible part of efforts to upgrade faculty competence in foreign culture. Frequently, returned grantees and foreign faculty on campus are the nucleus for the development of international activities on campus. The many multiplier effects of this exchange of individuals have been amply demonstrated.

But the problem of supporting continuity of academic relationships arising from a Fulbright experience remains a real one. The Senior Fulbright program rightly stresses the need to make exchange opportunities available to as many faculty as possible, so later repetition of grants is rare.

The Study's Final Report has already recommended increases in the Senior Fulbright program. In addition, it has been suggested to ICA that consideration be given to the development of an experimental program to support U.S./foreign institutional linkages with the middle income countries. Especially needed are small planning grants to allow for the development of linkages to be supported by other sources. Such a program is less costly than the full support required for individual exchanges, it equitably provides for two-way exchange, it has greater sustained impact on U.S. institutional programs, providing for continuity and including joint research as well as teaching as well. Also, it could provide greater participation of faculty from institutions on both sides now virtually excluded from the exchanges effort. Finally, it would help fill the needs of LDC institutions for strengthening through U.S. cooperation.

Advanced Research: The decline of opportunities for advanced research overseas, particularly in the developing world, is well documented. It is true for both area and problem focused work in nearly all fields, but is especially critical in the humanities and social sciences. The President's Commission is expected to make recommendations concerning area focused research, which hopefully will lead to improvements in the situation.

However, there are three aspects of the problem which the Study concludes might be alleviated by a greater emphasis on planned institutional partnership relations. They are (1) costs, (2) collaboration, and (3) increasingly restricted access to foreign countries for research purposes.

(1) Costs: Because linkages involve institutional investments for salaries, and total costs of foreign research are reduced.

(2) Collaboration: There is a rising demand for collaboration from foreign scholars who view much past American research as exploitative, contributing little or nothing to LDC needs. Increasingly, American scholars have accepted the justice of this criticism and in addition see that collaboration

is vital to the success of their work. Since institutional partnerships are built on the collaborative principle, they enlist foreign academic support.

(3) Access: Throughout the developing world there is a pronounced trend toward regulation of entry for research purposes. Many countries require American researchers to affiliate with a local institution and many call for lengthy and difficult procedures aimed at establishing the bona fides of individual American scholars. The establishment of long-term links between U.S. and LDC institutions can help to ease the entry requirements for students and faculty.

Foreign Language Training: The important work of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies renders superfluous any Study's comments or analysis of the problems of U.S. foreign language and area studies. It is hoped that the Commission's report and recommendations will lead to new directions and a major federal commitment in this area.

The Study's Final Report has been submitted to the Commission as will be this Supplementary Report. Hopefully, our discussion of the potential benefits of a greater institutional focus for exchanges will receive attention and prove useful. Area and language specialists have a special need for frequent opportunities to spend time in the country or region of their specialty. They also need sustained contact with the growing number of indigenous area specialists. Linkages offer great potential for building bridges and overcoming past resentments, to the mutual benefit of all. In addition, linkages provide a real incentive to faculty to develop, improve and maintain language competence in order to work effectively in non-English speaking areas. The BIFAD strengthening programs at Virginia State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and North Carolina A & T University all include faculty language training aimed at developing overseas linkages.

Educating Foreign Students: Many in international education point to the continuing growth and impressive size of the foreign student population in U.S. institutions as evidence of increased "globalization" of the system--a good thing. Certainly most educators and administrators do accept the fact that the presence of foreign students on campus is indeed a good thing, helping to broaden the experience of American students and faculty alike, provided the campus maintains a reasonably balanced and responsible admissions policy. However, there have been sufficient numbers of horrifying examples of cynicism in admissions practices designed to fill admissions quotas to suggest that the education of foreign students is not wholly an exercise in enlightenment. Further, across the board subsidies of large numbers of foreign students raises serious questions for public institutions about their priorities and public responsibilities. The impressive numbers of foreign students from the developing world are deceptive. At first glance, they might suggest an increased contribution by U.S. institutions to the development process. But the fact is that they are the result of what Harold Enarson has called "chaotic migration", a random process which favors the affluent, middle class student from a limited number of certain rich countries. This probably does not have significant impact on third world development.

In the LDC institution building period of the 1960's, donor support of foreign students focussed on staff development for educational institutions. In a recent paper, Ohio State President Enarson describes the impact of one such program:

> "Several years ago I was privileged to visit the Punjab Agricultural University in Ludhiana, India, and rejoiced in a welcome tendered by forty or so graduates of The Ohio State University. No scattershot aid here. No attempt to water the desert by sprinkling small quantities of water from a high flying airplane. No, by agreement between the Indian government and the U.S., Ohio State had served as the chosen instrument in institution-building. With the help of AID, promising students had been sent to Ohio State for advanced training, promising faculty had been sent as consultants to help develop the land-grant tradition. The result? A magnificent new university hard at work. A university which was making a difference in the lives of farmers, a university on the march.
>
> "Here was technology transfer at its best.
> "Here was foreign assistance at its best.
> "Here was U.S. faculty experience overseas at its best.
> "Here was foreign student study in a U.S. university at its best.
> "Here was study, both at Ohio State and in India, which enriched their scholars and ours, which contributed directly

> to the development process, which made excellent use of in India and in the U.S.
>
> "Here was the reserve of chaotic migration.
>
> "Ohio State's sister relationship with Punjab Agricultural University is a casualty of the fading U.S. interest in institution building. Our two universities drift apart. Today the students from India come to us as isolates. They return--if they do--to jobs thinly scattered through the vast expanse of India. And so it is with the thousand or so students from foreign lands now attending our university."[8]

The question of how many foreign students should be educated, from which countries and for what purposes is beyond the reach of this Study. (It also appears to be beyond the reach of our government and the educational community.) However, on the basis of analysis of American and foreign academic needs, there is a continuing need for LDC staff development and upgrading which is not being met, and that meeting this need is in the interest of U.S. institutions seeking to fulfill their service mission.

Planned institutional cooperative agreements can offer a small but significant answer to the frequently raised question of relevance and priority in educating foreign students since programs are jointly designed with graduate research often carried out in the home country.

Undergraduate Study Abroad: Opportunities for undergraduate study abroad are shrinking and opportunities to study outside of Western Europe nearly non-existant. Further, the costs are such that participation is essentially confined to the affluent student. Approximately 45,000 students (or less than one-half of one percent of all students enrolled in four-year institutions) study overseas annually with roughly half of them (22,000) in formal programs conducted by American institutions. Of these, 33 percent are enrolled in summer programs and 67 percent in one-year programs.

---

[8] Presentation to IIE's 1979 Washington Conference on International Education by Harold Enarson, President, Ohio State University.

There are more than 1,400 study abroad programs conducted by American institutions, consortia, Council on International Educational Exchange and other organizations. They are distributed regionally as follows:

	Academic Year	Summer	Total
Worldwide	37	25	62
Africa	14	11	25
Asia	51	15	66
Europe	501	564	1,065
Middle East	30	23	53
Latin America	66	86	152
TOTAL	699	724	1,423

Sources: Gail A. Cohen (ed.) U.S. College-Sponsored Programs Abroad: Academic Year (New York: Institute of International Education, 1977).
and
Gail A. Cohen (ed.) Summer Study Abroad (New York: Institute of International Education, 1977).

Average costs for tuition, room and board for one academic year range from $1,900 to $6,500. Costs are obviously prohibitive for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In fact, these opportunities are the almost exclusive prerogative of the middle class student. Yet the experience of study abroad is of inestimable value, both academically and for personal growth.

There are other problems with study abroad. There is frequent criticism that students too often are isolated from the foreign educational and social environment and would be improved by better integration in the host country. This is difficult and sometimes impossible given the education structural differences, but improvements could be made. Where programs do involve enrollment in local educational institutions, it is with the heavy subsidy of the foreign country. There are no tuition costs in much of the world. This leads to foreign resentment at the obvious lack of reciprocity. Recognizing this issue, the University of California study abroad program has tried to build a two-way interchange. The new Georgetown experiment in one-for-one exchange is also based on the principle of reciprocity.

Development of study abroad programs in the developing world is complicated by local enrollment pressure, limited facilities, especially in living accomodations, and structural differences.

It is the proposition of the Study that linkages and other programs of institutional cooperation can provide reciprocity and improve integration of students into host institutions. They can be particularly helpful in the exchanges with LDC's, improving the climate for acceptance.

Linkage Costs: Reduction of the costs of exchange are a major advantage of institutional linkages. Partnership relations rely heavily on in-kind contributions by participating institutions. Typically, salaries and benefits are maintained by both sides and tuition waived for graduate students and post-doctoral faculty. A majority of LDC institutions are prepared to provide housing. In some nearly self-supporting exchanges, houses and dormitory accommodations are exchanged on a one-for-one basis.

Required external funding is needed for travel and cost of living differentials for maintenance of the partnership, and travel funds for exploratory visits during its establishment.

Funding for linkages today comes primarily through public and private technical assistance donors and from LDC governments and institutions, many of which are prepared to furnish full costs. Unfortunately, most current funding focuses on agriculture and nutrition and in scientific and technical fields. Funding for humanities, social sciences and a number of professional specialties lag far behind.

Problems and Constraints of Linkages

Developing effective partnership relations do present a series of difficult problems, both for U.S. universities and their supporting sources, and for LDC universities. The Study can only begin here to list some of the problems that are most visible and dramatic. As planning goes forward, additional problems will undoubtedly become apparent. In all cases, effective partnership relations can only be developed if all parties are willing to raise problems openly and frankly, and to work collectively at solving them.

Planning and Resource Commitment: Currently international programs are funded by a wide variety of sources. Each of these typically is committed to some specific type of activity or goal; each desires and needs to retain considerable control over its resources if it is to achieve its goal. However, that partnership relationship must be jointly planned, with heavy inputs by the line faculty that will be directly involved in the activity. This lower level planning will require some capacity to commit resources.

A variant of this problem arises over the commitment of future funds. Funding sources are often understandably reluctant to commit funds for long periods into the future. Some funding sources change advisory boards and thus specific goals every year and are thus almost incapable of making long term commitments. Yet effective partnership relations will require planning for the long term. The question of whether funding sources will accommodate to the need for long term resource commitment cannot be answered, but indications are that more agencies are looking favorably at the linkage model.

The same question can be asked of universities themselves. Especially if line faculty on both sides are to be deeply involved in the planning and implementation of programs, how can universities make institutional commitments that last beyond possible faculty turnovers?

For all three variants of this problem, a basic issue is the extent to which planning and resource commitment can be made to accord with the priorities of all partners.

University Structures and Program Support: U.S. academic institutions, with strong departments, heavy research orientations and, for public institutions, heavy dependence on local (state) funding, sometimes present structural obstacles to effective partnership relations. Faculty are typically rewarded for teaching at home, for doing research and publishing in American journals and for service to national professional associations and local communities. Specific partnership programs may require, on the other hand, that U.S. faculty absent themselves for periods of a few years' work abroad. Campuses must restructure their internal reward systems sufficiently to encourage, and not to penalize, faculty for overseas work and service. Many institutions surveyed by the Study have been able to do this, but it remains a problem at many others. High-level university administration commitment to international education is an essential part of the solution.

One special aspect of this problem arises in cases where universities are funded by state legislatures. Elected representatives can naturally be expected to be concerned about their own constituents, as taxpayers and as consumers of public educational services. How does a state university mobilize resources from its own taxpayers for maintaining an international activity? Are there ways in which linkages can assist U.S. universities in bringing more of their international programs to local constituents through outreach? Experience suggests that they can, but only if the institutional policy explicitly acknowledges the importance of outreach in internationalizing. The programs at Wisconsin, VPI&SU and North Carolina A&T do so successfully.

One of the persistent problems of LDC universities lies in heavy, by U.S. standards excessive, teaching loads. Frequently coupled with this is a shortage of staff and funds for staff, generally weak professional association development within the country and few resources available for faculty research. All of this implies little emphasis on,or support for, research. Thus, if faculty are to be absent for research or teaching abroad, adequate personal and financial resources must be made available to meet the usual heavy teaching commitments. Linkage relations must be designed to take account of some of the problems of supporting teaching, research and service in these universities.

Institutional Disparities: The large U.S. universities are typically highly decentralized institutions. Even presidents have difficulty knowing the full scope of their own universities' international programs. And few of them can, in fact, commit their faculty to programs. Universities in developing countries are typically highly centralized, and also typically highly controlled by national governments. U.S. campuses have succeeded in overcoming the problem presented by this disparity through comprehensive planning for international education. Careful matching of institutions is important in alleviating the problem.

Area versus Problem Orientation: It is often observed that the greatest intellectual returns derive from a concentration on problems, whose identification and management are advanced by the abstractions and tools provided by the theoretical and methodological products of disciplines. At the same time, problems also require sensitive understanding of the specific social and cultural context in which they are situated and the specific language in which they are expressed. This implies that there is considerable utility in the study of specific geographic or cultural areas and their languages. The two demands, for problem and area expertise, are often in conflict. Competence in each requires considerable investment of time and effort on the part of individual scholars. Further, the conflict between problem and area studies is often given an organizational dimension, as each is the responsibility of different, and often competing, academic organizational units. Academic departments are powerful units in U.S. institutions, as are area study centers, especially those in leading centers of international studies.

In order to develop programs of real mutual benefit, both area interests and problem interests must be advanced and protected. The problem is to develop effective processes of cooperation between area and problem activities, to provide sufficient incentive to attract non-area committed scholars to work in LDC settings and to develop area-based programs that are sufficiently powerful in attending broader problems so that they will attract attention and recognition outside of area studies alone. Experience suggests that much past experience in linkages directed towards technical assistance has too often failed to solve these problems. Newer institutional actors often have an advantage because the different interests aren't fully established and planning can build in the necessary complementarity. In every instance, comprehensive administrative planning is essential to assure an integration of expertise for work overseas and to manage the impact of linkages on campus programs.

As already suggested, the linkage model can be an important added program dimension of area studies centers in the coming years.

Funding: Funding for linkage relationships is difficult despite their modest cost. Furthermore, funding that is available is heavily weighted towards science and technology leaving many disciplines, particularly in the humanities and professional specialties, untouched. Many campuses are finding support directly from foreign governments and from international organizations such as the U.N. and O.A.S. Greatly decreased support from established private philanthropy has taken a heavy toll in major research universities and a major effort to enlist support of new sectors of corporate philanthropy should be launched.

Some federal agencies have taken an interest in the linkage concept, and it is hoped that in the coming months several--including ICA, the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation--will consider programs of support for institutional cooperation.

In the meantime, successful linkage programs will depend on the entrepreneurial enterprise of each institution.